State Museum,
LUCKNOW.

HINDU CULTURE

BY

K. GURU DUTT

With a Foreword by
Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar

HIND KITABS LTD. BOMBAY

THIS VOLUME is devoted to an exposition of the Hindu view of Culture, broadly conceived in its religious, literary, educational, scientific and philosophical aspects. The author brings to bear on the subject the essentially modern Indian Outlook, putting forward an eloquent plea "for a sympathetic and reverent appreciation in general of the old Hindu ideals" enshrined in the sacred literature of India, viz., the *Vedās*, *Upaniṣads* and the *Gīta*. "The idea underlying the book," as he points out, "is that culture conceived as *puruṣārtha* demands for its fulfilment a combination of the contemplative and active principles in existence, which are fruitful only in union like *Śiva* and *Śakti*. The limitations of a one-sided approach like science have been stressed and a plea put forward for a sympathetic and reverent appreciation in general of the old Hindu ideals."

SOME OPINIONS:

"I have greatly enjoyed and much profited by a reading of your most useful and admirable book. I have long wished for some such statement regarding the essentials of the Hindu outlook of life. I hope the book will have an extensive circulation." —*Prof. J. H. Cousins.*

"It is an excellent work and says many things which need be said at the present critical time of cultural history. It should be particularly valuable to those Indians of the younger generation who feel and understand the importance of the search for truth. I find myself in agreement with most of your conclusions and must congratulate you upon the clear style in which you have expressed them." —*Dr. P. Brunton.*

"The conclusions you have arrived at on careful and thorough survey of Sanskrit literature from the *Vedas* down to the latest sayings of Sri Ramakrishna Paramahamsa admit of no alternatives . . . . . Your views like admonitions of a preceptor are a warning in time."

—*Dr. R. Shamasastry.*

Rs. 4-12

Also Library Edition **Rs. 6-12**

G-2
60

पुस्तकालय, लखनऊ
विभाग G-2
पुस्तक क्रम संख्या 60
Library, Lucknow

LAL BANARSI DASS
BANARAS.

STATE MUSEUM, LUCKNOW
LIBRARY

Acc. No.

Book No.

934

HINDU CULTURE

STATE MUSEUM, LUCKNOW
LIBRARY

Acc. No. ____________

Book No. ____________

934

HINDU CULTURE

934

HINDU CULTURE

ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES

BY

K. GURU DUTT

Director of Public Instruction in Mysore

WITH A FOREWORD BY

SACHIVOTHAMA SIR C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR

K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E.

विभाग G-2
पुस्तक संख्या 60
Museum Library, Lucknow

HIND KITABS LTD.
PUBLISHERS :: BOMBAY.

Rs. 4.75 nP.

First Published, January 1943
Second Edition February 1943
Third Enlarged Edition April 1951

COPYRIGHT

PRINTED BY U. NARASIMHA MALLYA, PROPRIETOR, THE B. B. D. POWER PRESS, COTTONPET, BANGALORE CITY; AND PUBLISHED BY U. S. MOHAN RAO, HIND KITABS LTD., 261-263, HORNBY ROAD, BOMBAY

DEDICATED
WITH HUMILITY AND LOVE
TO
HIS HOLINESS
ŚRĪMAD ĀNANDĀŚRAMA SWĀMIJI
OF ŚRĪ CHITRĀPUR MAṬHA
THE LIVING EMBODIMENT OF THE
SACRED WISDOM OF
INDIA

विभाग G-2
पुस्तक क्रम संख्या 60
Mission Library, Lucknow

Foreword

Mr. Guru Dutt, who is now Director of Public Instruction in Mysore State, is a busy and responsible official who has found the time and the opportunity not only to embark on extensive studies in Indian Literature and Philosophy but has utilised his knowledge and researches so as to elucidate the ideas underlying various aspects of ancient and medieval Indian thought.

In the volume entitled *Hindu Culture* he has collected a series of his articles and essays dealing with a wide variety of topics. Essentially, however, Mr. Guru Dutt is a mystic and he is specially attracted by the symbolism and doctrine embodied in the concept of Śakti. In his own language, the relation between philosophy and living is like that between Śiva and Śakti who are effective only in union, the union of Śakti namely vitality, and life namely Caitanya, both intimately linked up with Buddhi or discriminative understanding. The author, equating this Śakti with the energising principle in the Universe from which every form of activity proceeds, studies the Vedas with advertence to the emergence of this idea, and his analyses of the hymns to *Aditi* and *Gāyatrī*, *Uṣā* and *Sarasvatī* are very stimulating. So absorbed is Mr. Guru Dutt in this aspect of Godhead that in dealing with the genius of the Sanskrit language, he equates the equilibrium found in the structure and substance of that language with

Yogic experience resulting in Ādi-vidyā. With this background, he has produced in his essay on "*Kashmir Śaivism*" a very thorough study of the interactions between Buddhism introduced into Kashmir during the reign of Aśoka and the original faith of the country which was the worship of Śiva-Śakti in the form of Ardhanārīśvara. He expounds in this essay his favourite thesis that Hinduism is at least as Tantric in structure as Vaidik and that even Buddhism which started as a protest against the Brahmanical Vedic ritual finally arrived at a fundamental agreement with Hindu thought in the Mahāyāna Tantras. The system of thought and ritual known as Spanda and also designated as Trika is of special interest as furnishing a close link between the North and the South, the Śaiva Siddhānta and the Trika systems being very closely related. At the end of this article, is a suggestive discussion of the doctrine of the multiplicity of selves with which modern psychology largely concerns itself. Freud's classification of the Id and Super-Ego and Jung's analysis of the Anima and the Persona are adverted to and the author illustrates the gradual approximation of modern thought to ancient speculation. His conclusion is that the Trika system combines the good points of most other systems and does not effect a break with the tradition of the Vedas and the Upaniṣads; and he specifically mentions its preference of the principle of Śakti to the doctrine of Māyā and is attracted by its general psychological approach.

In discussing whether India has a philosophy of her own, Mr. Guru Dutt launches an attack on certain exclusive claims which used to be made by science until quite recently. He quotes from a recent savant that the materialistic and mechanistic views of the last century are giving place to speculations akin to mysticism. In fact, through the greater part of this volume there is present the recognition of the limitations of science.

The author postulates in his "Foundations of Hindu Culture" that its characteristic has been its concern with direct experience, right through its history from the Ṛgveda to the Gītā. In dealing with Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia's article, the author in his essay on "What is Wrong with Hinduism?" attacks the political and economic nationalism which, by a process of reaction, Dr. Lohia so fiercely advocates. Mr. Guru Dutt denies Dr. Lohia's thesis that the scientific and secular spirit plus the ethical content of Christianity would be an adequate substitute for the Hindu Dharma.

The underlying theme of the book may be described as an advocacy of Culture which, according to the author, involves a harmonised emotional personality in which man's complexes do not obstruct the realisation of his highest aspirations. Again, dealing with success and progress, the author is insistent that the stress should be more on the emotional side of man's nature than on the intellectual, especially in the circumstances of the modern world. Dealing with the development of recent theories and assailing the view-point of philosophers like Russell based on mechanistic materialism, Mr. Guru Dutt emphasises that psychology must start with the self if it is to make any advance at all and he thus explains the failure of modern psychology: "You cannot explain the self in terms of the non-self." He emphasises a passage from a recent Gifford lecturer: "The self and its unique status, its standing as a factor, a primary factor and an organising factor in the universal whole, will have to be allowed. Personality must be reinstated in its true place in the Universe."

It is hoped that enough has been indicated to show how deep and varied have been the sources of Mr. Guru Dutt's learning and speculation and how truly instructive this slender volume should be to those who are concerned with the quest of the spirit.

MADRAS,
12—4—1951

C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR

State Museum,
LUCKNOW.

Preface

THIS VOLUME brings together some of the addresses which the author had occasion to deliver to academic and other audiences, as indicated in the footnotes, and also a few essays and articles which were published from time to time. Some of them had appeared in book form about ten years ago with the title "*A Hindu View of Culture*", The edition was sold out within a few months and ever since then, there has been a continuous and insistent demand for the book. It is in response to this that the present collection has been brought out with substantial additions *viz.*, "The Perspective of the Tantras" which had appeared in *Triveni*, "Kashmir Śaivism" in the *Aryan Path* and "What is wrong with Hinduism?" in the *Deccan Herald* of Bangalore. It may be mentioned that the articles "Śri Ramakrishna and the Divine Mother" and "The Foundations of Hindu Culture" had appeared in the *Vedanta Kesari* and "The Concept of Śakti in the Veda" in the *Triveni*. Two of the papers *viz.*, "Has India at present any Philosophy of her own?" and "What is wrong with Hinduism?" although apparently controversial in form, have been included as the former deals with the question of the applicability of the scientific method to philosophy, which is integrally connected with the subject matter of other papers included in this series *e.g.*, "The Growth of Science", and "Philosophy and Living"; and the latter deals with the live question of the significance of Hinduism in the present day context.

Although some of the papers still bear the mark of the spoken word and of the type of audience to whom they were addressed, and there is some unavoidable repetition and overlapping of ideas, still it is hoped that as a whole they present a certain unity of outlook regarding the essentials of Hindu Culture, which the author has tried to bring into relation with modern thought. In doing so he has not kept apart the religious, philosophical and practical standpoints. He is convinced that such separation, however useful for comparative study, is sterile for cultural ends. No excuse is therefore offered for the manner of presentation even though it runs the risk of being dubbed medieval. Nor is any claim made for originality, for the author is only too conscious of his indebtedness. The idea underlying the book is that culture conceived as *Puruṣārtha* demands for its fulfilment a combination of the contemplative and active principles in experience, which are fruitful only in union like *Śiva* and *Śakti*. The limitations of a one-sided approach like science have been stressed and a plea put forward for a sympathetic and reverent appreciation in general of the old Hindu ideals.

The author considers it his great good fortune that a statesman-scholar of the eminence of Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar has written a Foreword to the book, which is not merely conventional but is a critical review and appreciation of the contents of the book. The author is deeply indebted to him for his kindness.

It may be added here that as the volume is intended mainly for the general reader, and the use of diacritical marks has been limited to the extent absolutely necessary, the transliteration of Sanskrit words may not fully satisfy the requirements of meticulous scholarship.

BANGALORE,
17th April 1951

K. G. D.

Contents

Page

FOREWORD vii

PREFACE xi

1. THE FOUNDATIONS OF HINDU CULTURE ... 1
2. PHILOSOPHY AND LIVING ... 19
3. HAS INDIA AT PRESENT ANY "PHILOSOPHY" OF HER OWN? 38
4. THE CONCEPT OF ŚAKTI IN THE VEDA ... 56
5. THE GENIUS OF THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE ... 64
6. SRI RAMAKRISHNA AND THE DIVINE MOTHER 82
7. THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE TANTRAS ... 94
8. KASHMIR ŚAIVISM 117
9. SUCCESS 147
10. PROGRESS 153
11. WHITHER PSYCHOLOGY? 157
12. EDUCATION OF THE EMOTIONS ... 162
13. THE GROWTH OF SCIENCE ... 169
14. LANGUAGE—ITS SCOPE AND FUNCTION ... 194
15. THE AIM OF EDUCATION ... 212
16. WHAT IS WRONG WITH HINDUISM? ... 230

THE FOUNDATIONS OF HINDU CULTURE

ALL of us have a working idea of what culture signifies. If, however, a definition is attempted, it is easier to say what it is not, rather than what it is. Of late, it has become usual to speak of culture and civilization as if they were synonymous. As an instance in point, may be cited a passage from Dr. Perry's book: *The Growth of Civilization.* This is how he commences one of his chapters: "The world is tenanted by people in various stages of culture. At one end of the scale are societies such as our own, with all the resources of civilization, with innumerable means of overcoming time and space, and of living a life of infinite complexity. At the other end of the scale are those that have made practically no progress in the arts and crafts, who still wander about seeking their food where they may get it." The idea is that culture is a thing which began with the flint axe, developed into the copper chisel and finally into the elaborate machinery of the present day. We read not about man's highest aspirations, of his yearning for God and for his fellow-man, but rather of his greed for tin and copper, for coal and iron, and for silver and gold and petroleum. It is the history of these great gods which is being presented as the history of civilization and of culture: of how from small and non-existent beginnings these gods have come to be the mighty beings they are today, how they have favoured their worshipper, man, and how both have gone on mutually augmenting and profiting each other through the long ages—a strange parody of the interdependence of gods and men spoken of in the *Bhagavad Gītā*. The course of man's life on earth looks verily like a protracted sacrificial session—a *Dīrghasattra*—to these gods. To many in the modern age all the activities of man appear to be nothing more than oblations offered on the altar of civilization and the State. Thus an author exclaims: "The culture of the individual! What is that but the images and shadows of happenings in mighty States? The very words you utter are sparks smitten from the hard anvil of civilization, and there has been no civilization apart from the highly organized State." One is tempted to ask the age-old question of the *Ṛgveda* "To which god shall we offer oblation?"—*Kasmai devāya haviṣā vidhema*?

The traditional culture of India, however, is in marked contrast to this. It has been essentially individualistic. The embodied personality of man was the nucleus round which all other considerations ranged themselves. This embodied personality was called *Puruṣa*, meaning "he who resides in the city called the body: *puri śayah*". The body was described symbolically as the city with nine gates (*navadvāra*), the gates being the outlets of the senses. This *Puruṣa* has been the subject of culture, not the citizen in the political sense. The *Puruṣa* was considered potentially divine; and the Supreme Person or *Puruṣottama* residing in the body was deemed the recipient of all *Yajñas* or sacrifices. In the words of the *Bhagavad Gītā*: "That which underlies all the gods is *Puruṣa*, and I alone (*i.e.*, The Supreme Lord) am he who underlies all sacrifices here in this body." The culture of the individual consisted in realizing the goal or the fourfold objective of this *Puruṣa*, *i.e.*, *Puruṣārtha*. In this fourfold scheme of obligation, acquisition, enjoyment and final emancipation, *Dharma* or social and ethical obligation is given primacy in the interest of the individual himself, a portion of whose personality would be starved and stunted but for this. Besides *Dharma*, the other objectives too have their claims upon the attention of man. The individual is not considered as an oblation to an all-devouring Society or organized State in the political sense, to be sacrificed for the sake of the greater disembodied being. On the other hand, social obligation is placed on a par with man's other natural and individual aspirations, namely, with *Artha* or desire for wealth and domination, *Kāma* or craving for the enjoyment of the senses and *Mokṣa* or his deep-seated hankering for ultimate freedom from all bonds. All these four are often brought together under *Dharma*, a most comprehensive term in which all the strands of Indian culture have been woven together. In its essence, *Dharma* is that by which man is borne up: *Dhāryate anena: iti dharmaḥ*. It is that which supports and bears up man's personality for the full realization of the *Puruṣārthas*. On the contrary, anything which breaks up a man's personality and thwarts his realization of all the *Puruṣārthas* is not *Dharma*. *Dharma* is not merely a social and ethical norm or standard, but is something intimate and personal: hence the doctrine of *Svadharma* or congenial *Dharma* which has been propounded in the *Gītā*.

Dharma considered as equivalent to the four *Puruṣārthas* has often been pictured in our mythology as a cow, a quadruped. Each of its limbs is as important as any other, and any mutilation would affect the body as a whole. That Age of man is true in which the cow moves about with all its limbs intact. It is called *Satya-yuga.* It is not any historical age that is meant but rather the spiritual stage of the individual. Various stages of mutilation of the *Dharma* have been described in the *Purāṇas,* until the miserable cow has come to hobble along on only one leg. It does not matter what that leg is: be it *Dharma* itself in the restricted sense of morality, or *Mokṣa* in the sense of a perverted seeking of individual freedom at the cost of all else, or the seeking of *Artha* and *Kāma* by themselves divorced from their companions. It would appear as if for the large majority of people in the world today, *Artha* is the only *Puruṣārtha.* Economics and politics (*Arthaśāstra*) are the only sciences which matter. It is not the individual *Puruṣa* that counts, but some huge disembodied being like Society or the State, capable of greed and pride collectively, but impervious to weal and woe. Culture has come to be equated with civilization.

The grand means for the realization of *Puruṣārtha* was called *Yajña* or sacrifice. With the very different modes of thinking into which we have worked ourselves in the present day, it is difficult indeed for us to realize what *Yajña* meant to the ancient world. The conception was universal and not peculiar to India. It was developed by the Egyptians and the Babylonians no less than by the Chinese and the aboriginal inhabitants of the Americas. At a time when communications were so extremely difficult, this identity of conception appears nothing short of a miracle. Yet it is doubtful whether the full import of this miracle has been appreciated by the modern world. The chief cause for this lack of appreciation appears to be the want of respect and reverence for conceptions alien to their own, which characterises so-called civilized peoples of the present day, who are only too inclined to treat as primitive superstition whatever they do not understand. *Yajña* is not studied as if it were a reality but only as an exploded delusion. The basic and fundamental idea underlying *Yajña* is given in the *Bhagavad Gītā*: "From food come forth beings: from rain food is produced: from *Yajña* arises rain and *Yajña* is born of *Karma*. Know *Karma* to have arisen from the Veda, and the Veda from the Imperishable. Therefore the all-pervading Veda is ever centred in *Yajña*." In a general way many of us may not seriously object to that view. But if pressed hard we would find it difficult to accept literally the truth of the link—from *Yajña* arises rain. Yet in the literal acceptance of this is centred the whole concept of *Yajña*.

To the Vedic worshippers sacrifice was a science—the science of *Yajña*. Together, the three Vedas were called the threefold science or *Trayīvidyā*. The experiences described therein were real in the most fundamental sense, and not merely in the fanciful and poetic. Perhaps no people in history have been so truthful as these ancient Āryans; and what they have left on record has to be taken seriously and not as the superstitious delusions of an unscientific age. This innate truthfulness has been the most characteristic feature of Indian culture through the ages. As is said in the *Mahābhārata*: Truth alone prevails and not falsehood: *Satyam eva jayate nānṛtam.*

Through the ages the prayer has gone forth: From the unreal lead me on to the real: *asato mā sad gamaya.* One of the highest praises bestowed upon the gods in the Veda is that they are *Satyāḥ*, true, truthful, trustworthy. Other words applied to the gods as truthful beings are:—*adrogha* which means literally not deceiving. *Adroghavāk* means he whose world is never broken. Thus Indra is said to have been praised by the *Pitṛs* as 'reaching the enemy, overcoming him, standing on the summit, true of speech, most powerful in thought'. *Droghavāk* on the contrary is used for deceitful men. Thus Vasiṣṭha, the great Vedic *Ṛṣi*, exclaims: "If I had worshipped false gods, or if I had believed in the gods vainly—but why art thou angry with us O *Jātavedas*?—may liars go to utter destruction". Such was their regard for truth; and truth for them was not merely an intellectual proposition like the statement that two and two make four, or that the sun rises in the east, but something fundamental, the very backbone and support of existence—physical as well as psychological. Thus we have the Mantra *satyenottabhitā bhūmiḥ*—this earth is propped up by truth. Thus the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* has it: "Whosoever speaks the truth, makes the fire on his own altar blaze up, as if he poured butter into the lighted fire. His own light grows larger and larger and from tomorrow to tomorrow he becomes better. But whosoever speaks untruth, he quenches the fire on his altar, as if he poured water into the lighted fire; his own light grows smaller and smaller and from tomorrow to tomorrow he becomes more wicked. Let man therefore speak the truth only." There is also the following story told in the same *Brāhmaṇa*: "His

State Museum,
LUCKNOW.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

kinsman said to Aruṇa Aupaveśi: 'Though art advanced in years, establish thou the sacrificial fires'. He replied 'Thereby you tell me henceforth to keep silence. For he who has established the fires must not speak an untruth'. To that extent the service of the sacrificial fires consists in truth."

So much for truth or *Satya*. But there is another concept in the Veda which is most frequently coupled with *Satya* and that is *Ṛta*. It is twin with *Satya*. Thus we find in the *Ṛgveda*, "Out of arduous *Tapas* were born *Satya* and *Ṛta*". The word *Ṛta* is etymologically identical with the English word 'right'. In the Veda it stands for moral law as well as the natural order. Its function is cosmic as well as psychic. In fact it is the earliest counterpart of the word *Dharma*. *Ṛta* is something more than truth, as it combines in itself the idea of righteousness also. The word *Ṛta* is stated to be phonetically identical with the Zoroastrian *Asa*, which also means truth and right. The word had close affinities with the Chinese *Tao*—the right way or the order of the Universe. In the words of Macdonell: "It would be in the spirit of all three religions to say: *Asa*, or *Ṛta*, or *Tao* is the basis of Religion." We will now examine the Vedic concept of *Ṛta* with greater attention. Of this Dr. Carpenter writes: "Here is that which exists before heaven and earth; they are born of it and even in it, and its domain is the wide space. From it likewise, the gods proceed; and the lofty pair, *Mitra* and *Varuṇa*, with *Aditi* and her train, are its protectors. But through the mystical identity of the order of Nature and the order of the sacrifice, the cultus—whether on earth or in heaven—is also its sphere. *Agni*, the sacrificial fire, the dear house priest, is *Ṛta*-born, and by its aid carries the offerings to heaven. Such also is the sacred drink, the *Soma* which is borne in the *Ṛta's* car and follows its ways and the heavenly sacrificers, the fathers in the radiant world above, have grown according to the *Ṛta*, for they know and faithfully obey the law. Thus it becomes the supreme expression of morality and is practically equivalent with *Satya*, true (literally that which is) or good. Heaven and Earth are *Satya*, veracious; they can be trusted; they are *Ṛtāvān*, faithful to the path, steadiest in the order. Not less so is the godly man; he too is *Ṛtāvān*, the same word being used to denote divine and human piety. And thus the life of gods and men, the order of nature, the ritual of worship and daily duty were all bound together in one principle."

In the following symbolic words *Ṛgveda* describes the concept: "Many are the waters of *Ṛta*: the adoration of *Ṛta* destroys iniquities; the intelligent and brilliant praise of *Ṛta* has opened the deaf (ears) of man. Many are the sustaining and stable and delightful forms of the embodied *Ṛta*; by *Ṛta* are (the pious) expectant of food; by *Ṛta* have the kine entered into the sacrifice. The worshipper subjecting *Ṛta* verily enjoys *Ṛta*: the strength of *Ṛta* is (developed) with speed and is desirous of (possessing) water: to *Ṛta* belong the wide and profound heaven and earth: supreme milch kine, they yield their milk to *Ṛta*."

Ṛta is seen to be an eminently practical conception. It is a thing which can be attained, and the means for its attainment is called *Yajña*. By this means man

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

enters into *Ṛta*, and the *Ṛta* enters into man. What is needed is not the understanding of *Ṛta* in the intellectual sense, but the practising of it. Then man is at home in the universe; the earth and heaven become his parents; the winds and rain show their kinship; and he sees the identity of the light that is in man and the light that is in the sun. In the words of the *Ṛgveda* "The winds blow sweetness to the sacrificer and the rivers flow sweetness." Let us not forget the untranslatable significance of the verb *ṛtāyate* formed out of the word *Ṛta*. *Yajña* was the cult or cultus and *Ṛta* was the culture, the realization of it. This *Ṛta* was perceived not by itself in the abstract, but in the shape of the several gods or *Devas*. Shall we call them the embodiments of culture? These gods with Indra at their head were no other than the faculties of man through which his consciousness shines forth. The word *Deva* means shining, and the word *Indriya* which means 'derived from Indra' stands for man's senses. We should note particularly the sacredness and reverence with which the senses were treated. The senses had not yet been contaminated with the touch of sin by the *Asuras*, as for example is to be seen in the word 'sensual'. The pristine glory of the senses had not yet been clouded. They were perceived as the *Kalās* or digits of the Supreme *Puruṣa*. Not merely were the faculties *Deva* (divine) but what they perceived was also *Deva*. Thus in the *Praśna Upaniṣad* the disciple Bhārgava Vaidarbhi asks the Ṛṣi Pippalāda: "Revered Sir, how many are the gods who support the creatures? How many of them manifest it? And who again is the greatest of them?" The sage replies that *Ākāśa* is that god, and

Vāyu and *Agni* and *Āpaḥ* and *Pṛthivi* and also speech, mind, the eye and the ear; and that the central principle of life, *Prāṇa*, is the greatest of them all. He goes on to illustrate it by a parable and eulogises *Prāṇa* as follows: He burns as fire; he is the cloud; he is Indra; he is the wind. This bright one is (verily) earth, matter, what is and what is not and also what is immortal."

What is noteworthy here is the blending of the perceiver and the perceived. These gods are neither physical like the cloud and fire nor do they subsist wholly in man's imagination, but are a reality of a subtle and new order which might be truly called metaphysical or *Sūkṣma*. In worshipping them man kept closest to Nature. Take for example fire or *Agni*. He was worshipped in the physical fire; yet he was not different from the fire that is within man, that digests his food and assimilates it: *Jaṭharāgni*; He was not different from the fire that digests facts of experience and results in understanding: *Jātavedas* (who understands all that exists); he was not different from the fire of devotion and piety: *Śraddhā*; finally it was *Agni* who was the worshipper as well as the worshipped. He was conceived as a person, yet the conception was not wholly anthropomorphic. He was the medium through which all the other gods were propitiated: thus he was a sort of common denominator for all the gods. He possesses the characteristics of practically every god and can in no sense be deemed an individual like a human being. What he was perceived as, and what was expected from him, could be better grasped from the very first *Sūkta* of the *Ṛgveda*.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

"I magnify *Agni* the domestic priest, the divine ministrant of the sacrifice, the invoker, the best bestower of treasure. *Agni* is to be magnified by past and present seers, may he conduct the gods here. Through *Agni* may one obtain wealth day by day (and) prosperity, glorious (and) most abounding in heroes. O *Agni*, the worship and sacrifice thou encompassest on every side, that same goes to the gods. May *Agni* the invoker, of wise intelligence, the true, of most brilliant fame, the god, come with the gods. Just what good thou O *Agni*, wilt thou do for the worshipper, that (purpose) of thee (comes) true, O *Angiras*. To thee, O *Agni*, day by day, O illuminer of gloom, we come with thought bringing homage; (to thee) ruling over sacrifices, the shining guardian of order (*Ṛta*), growing in thine own house. So, O *Agni*, be easy of access to us, as a father to his son: abide with us for our well-being."

The objectives of the Vedic culture are tangible and full-blooded. They are neither quietistic nor ascetic. There is a healthy joy in life, and the spirit of adventure. It might be thought that all this was compensated for by the Upaniṣads. In fact it has been suggested that the Upaniṣads represent a sort of reaction against the Vedas. But this is more apparent than real. Any number of passages could be quoted from the Upaniṣads to show that they are the natural completion of the *Saṃhitā*. They are the fruits of the same tree of which the *Saṃhitā* and *Brāhmaṇa* are the trunk and branches. The following citation from the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* will bear this out: "May He, the Supreme among all Vedas, the One of Universal form, born of the immortal Vedas, Indra,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

enliven me with intelligence. Of the immortal, O God, may I be the possessor. May my body be fit; may my tongue be sweet; with ears much may I hear. The sheath of *Brahman* art Thou, enveloped by intelligence; may Thou protect what I have heard."

The old Indian culture seems to have been very much concerned with direct experience, as far as possible without the intermediacy of material things. Material things were used, but as symbols. Thus fire was tended not so much because it could melt the metals and cook food; but rather because Fire was a symbol of God, through which man could have direct access to the inner regions of his consciousness, or shall we say, unconsciousness? By meditating on him, regions of experience of which man is ordinarily unaware, were brought within his ken. It was Fire that led man by the true path, to bliss and enjoyment. *Agni* was aware of all his acts and He destroyed that crookedness which is in man and is called sin. This is what is meant by the prayer which we find in the *Īśa Upaniṣad*, "Guide us, O *Agni*, by the road of bliss to enjoyment, O god who knowest all acts. Destroy our crooked sin that we may offer thee our best salutations." The worshipper contemplated the sun not as a mass of incandescent gas, but rather as *Pūṣan*: he who nourished life. Thus he addressed him: "O *Pūṣan* who with thy golden disc has covered up the face of Truth, uncover it so that I who am intent on *Satya* and *Dharma* may be vouchsafed thy vision." There is ample evidence that these prayers were answered. There is the ring of truth and authenticity in the declarations made. Thus the *Ṛṣi* has cried in exultation: "We have drunk the

Soma; we have become immortal; we have reached the light; we have found the gods: What can hostility now do to us, and what the malice of mortal man, O immortal one?" Again another *Ṛṣi* has exclaimed: "I have realized this great Being who shines effulgent like the sun beyond all darkness."

The process by which these results were achieved was called *Yajña*, as we have already seen. *Yajña* functioned in the region of experience known as *Ṛta* which may also be called *Adhidaiva*. On the one side was the purely physical inanimate cosmos of which visible space, infinitely divisible, was the manifestation, and on the other was the subjective self in man, one and indivisible. They are the *Adhibhūta* and the *Adhyātma*. Both are recognised by us moderns; but for us there is no link between them. But ancient Indian culture possessed the link between these two; and that was the region of the *Adhidaiva* where the infinite variety of the external world and the unity of the self were subtly blended together, as in man's personality. That is what is meant by the statement in the *Gītā* that *Puruṣa* is *Adhidaivata*. It was in this region that *Yajña* was effective. Man attuned himself to the physical universe and he attained such harmony with it that he could say without untruth 'from *Yajña* arises rain'. The creation of the universe itself has been pictured as a cosmic *Yajña* in that celebrated hymn of the *Ṛgveda* called the *Puruṣasūkta*. The primeval *Puruṣa* is described therein as thousand-headed, thousand-eyed and thousand-footed, as enveloping the world on all sides, then extending beyond it. *Puruṣa* is all this, whatever has been and will be. He is the lord of immortality, yet it is he who takes food and grows beyond mortality. Such is his greatness. A fourth of him is all beings and three-fourths of him are what is immortal in heaven. There was a symbolical *Yajña* in which this *Puruṣa* divided himself into this ordered universe, animate and inanimate. Thus was the sacrifice established by the *Devas*. Thus order was introduced into chaos: the apparently inanimate forces of the universe reached godhead and became accessible to realization: *sādhyās santi devāḥ*.

Yajña was thus an experimental method and it was obviously successful. A reputed scientific writer, Dr. Georges Sarton, has said rather complacently: "The great intellectual division of mankind is not along geographical or racial lines, but between those who understand and practise the experimental method and those who do not understand and do not practise it." But if asked what experimental method is, he would reply perhaps that it consists in mixing potassium chlorate and manganese dioxide and heating them with a view to getting oxygen. So it is, but the case is purely *Ādhibhautika* or material. The experimental method could be applied to the subtler regions also, *viz.*, to the *Ādhidaivika*. Such experimental methods were *Yoga* and *Yajña*. What shall we say of those that refuse to understand or practise them, before judging them and stigmatising them as superstition and magic? A favourable attitude and sympathy will surely bring in their train and in good time, the requisite understanding and perhaps practice. *Yajña* will then no longer be thought of as something alien to man, but rather as twin born with him, by which he thrives and attains his ends, namely, the *Puruṣārthas* (chief values of life).

The ideal of *Yajña* has no doubt degenerated: and this must be due to the preponderance of *Anṛta* (the power opposed to the right and the good) over *Ṛta*. The vicissitudes of these two forces graphically described in our literature read to us a great cultural lesson. In the *Brāhmaṇas* it has been said: Viṣṇu verily is *Yajña*, and as we know, Viṣṇu goes to sleep for long periods. At such times *Anṛta*, which is the antithesis of *Ṛta*, prevails. *Yajña* is done, but the offerings are snatched away by the *Asuras* and the *Rākshasas*. These *Asuras* are close kinsmen of the *Devas*. The *Devas* and *Asuras* are represented in our mythology as fighting with each other all the time and with varied success. Sometimes the gods prevail and sometimes the *Asuras*. The gods are those wholesome and rounded tendencies in man, which conduce to his realization of all the *Puruṣārthas* On the contrary the *Asuras* are hypertrophied tendencies in which some faculty or aspect is allowed to grow at the expense of the others. There is always a growth of power in one direction coupled with atrophy in others. Shall we say that the *Asuras* are bloated specialists and reckless record-breakers? For example there was Rāvaṇa with ten heads. What could this signify but exaggeration of brain power? It is said that Kabandha was all arms and no body, and that he grabbed everything which came within his grasp for a distance of seven leagues (*Yojanas*). What is this but greed personified and magnified? All these were destroyed by the touch of Śrī Rāma who is described as the embodiment of harmony and comeliness: *āryas sarvasamaś caiva sadaika priya darśanaḥ.*

Rāma prevailed in the long run, although he had his bad days when he lived as an exile in the forest, and his wife was taken away as a captive by Rāvaṇa. This would be a good allegorical description of the course of Indian culture, and no true Indian will hesitate about his allegiance as between them. But in the meantime it will be remembered that Rāvaṇa had defeated the *Devas* and kept them all in bondage, and the *Rākṣasas* were fattening on the oblations intended for the gods. It should not be thought that the *Asuras* were averse to *Yajña*. No, on the contrary they were very anxious that *Yajña* should be performed; but in their honour, and not in the service of the gods. After all, it should not be forgotten that *Yajña* was only the means, like *Tapas* and *Yoga*. Rāvaṇa as well as many, in fact all the *Asuras*, were great *Tapasvins* (ascetics and *Yogis*). But by their asceticism and *Yoga* they did not desire the growth of *Ṛta* but of *Anṛta*. It is said that the *Rākṣasas* used even the Vedas for their own purposes, like the devil quoting scripture. They were *Brahmarākṣasas*. Thus when Hanumān went to Lanka on his first trip, it is described that in the dead of night he heard the holy chanting of the *Brahmarākṣasas* who were experts in all the six auxiliaries of the Vedas and had performed the greatest sacrifices.

The *Bhagavad Gītā* says that the divine qualities lead to freedom while the demoniac qualities lead to bondage. The former go along the line of surrender, along the channels of the cosmic *Prāṇa*: Indra and *Indriya*. On the other hand the *Asuras* are the deadly enemies of Indra. They are compact of egoism or *Ahankāra*, and they lead on from glamour to glamour into veritable orgies of futile and destructive action. "With vain hopes, with futile actions, with the semblance of knowledge, and devoid of sense they take refuge in the delusive nature of *Rākṣasas* and *Asuras*" (*Gītā*). Whether we follow the *Devas* or the *Asuras* is not so much a matter of choice as of nature, *Svabhāva.* But for those for whom choice is possible, the *Devas* and *Asuras* have first to be recognized before any choice could be made and this recognition is no easy matter. It is said that the *Devas* love the indirect approach: *parokṣa priyāvai devāḥ.* They are not *Pratyakṣa,* perceptible. As for the *Asuras* they are said to be *Kāmarūpins,* protean in form. They assume what shape they please at will. Śūrpaṇakhā assumed a lovely shape and tried to inveigle Śrī Rāma. Mārīca assumed the shape of a golden deer and Rāvaṇa that of a holy *Sannyāsi.* We must see through the forms before we make the choice. That is the significance of the oft-repeated statement in the ancient Hindu books that the path of *Dharma* is indeed *Sūkṣma* or subtle.

To sum up: let it not be thought that unauthorized use of the word culture is made here. It has been said at the outset that Indian culture is identical with the *Dharma.* There is also another word which could be equated with it, and that is *Sampat. Sampat* does not consist of material goods, but of experience which is *Sūkṣma.* We have tried to differentiate between the *Daivī-sampat* and the *Āsurī-sampat.* With this object we have tried to show the common ground between the oldest document of Indian culture and a more modern and universally popular one, which may well be called a manual of Indian culture: the *Ṛgveda* and the *Bhagavad Gītā*. They might be deemed the Old and New Testaments of India. We are not criticizing any alien culture or civilization. It is not that any culture is wholly 'divine' or 'demoniac'. It is mostly a question of tendencies. There can be no denying that the ruling tendencies of Indian culture have been 'divine'. That is the moral we can draw from the *Itihāsas* and the *Purāṇas*. The *Rāmāyaṇa* shows the victory of the 'divine' tendencies over the obviously 'demoniac'. The *Mahābhārata* shows the ultimate triumph of *Dharma* and his brothers over the camouflaged *Asuras*: Duryodhana and his brood. All these drive to a single conclusion regarding the goal of all true culture: the embodied *Puruṣa* and the Supreme *Puruṣa*, *Śiva* and *Śakti*, *Nara* and *Nārāyaṇa*, Arjuna and Śrī Kṛṣṇa—they should never be separated one from the other. Where they are joined together will be found all the elements of a glorious culture: wealth and success, welfare and morality, everlasting.

PHILOSOPHY AND LIVING*

"WHAT is truth, said jesting Pilate, and would not stay for an answer." Bacon's famous commencement of his Essays will serve us indifferently well for a beginning. The gist of the question is really what is philosophy? But Pontius Pilate was not by temperament a philosopher. He was a matter-of-fact man and knew that he would get no answer even if he should wait for two millenniums. That must have been the reason for his impatience. Besides, he was not serious about the answer, for he asked his question only in jest. He had made up his mind in advance that there could possibly be no answer, and he was only having his joke at the expense of the philosophers. He was probably wiser than he knew. The course of philosophy, at least in the West, seems to be a sad commentary on Pilate's attitude and really his justification. For all the advance and certainty attained in other fields of knowledge, philosophy appears to be the one region where there is least agreement or certainty. In this sphere, the doctrine of Progress does not seem to hold sway. Plato still remains the high-water mark of European philosophy. Metaphysics is at present more or less looked down upon by the scientist as well as layman. Thus a well-known scientific writer has said that every gain in physics was at the expense of some accepted piece of metaphysics. While for the average man, metaphysics is but a search by a blind man in a dark room for a black cat which is not there! On the fundamental questions of philosophy: "What is mind?", the answer still seems to be, "no matter"; and "What is matter?"—"never mind".

---

* Inaugural Address delivered before the Philosophical Association of the Maharaja's College, Mysore, in 1941.

Philosophy may thus be at bottom a matter of temperament and there may be certain temperaments in which philosophy simply will not grow. As the scholar said to Boswell, "I have tried too in my time to be a philosopher, but I do not know how, cheerfulness was somehow breaking in." The scholar had a practical philosophy which was perhaps better than that spun by the serious professional philosophers. But he knew that his philosophy would not be acknowledged as such by them. So he declined to step into the arena. For Boswell's genial scholar philosophy manifested itself in living, but for a philosophy dealing solely with verbal explanations he did not much care. It must have been the latter which F. H. Bradley had in mind when he characterised philosophy as the finding of bad reasons for what we believe upon instinct. He hastens to add, "But to find those reasons is no less an instinct." One wonders why "bad reasons". He could have said with greater justice, the best possible reasons according to one's own lights. But then Bradley was obviously thinking of other people's reasons and not his own, and was merely saying that his lights differed from theirs. Every man may thus be considered as instinctively harbouring a philosophy, which he occasionally tries to articulate. Philosophy in the West has been mainly concerned with systematic description and the attempt to explain on rational lines the influences and opinions which have prevailed in society

State Museum, LUCKNOW.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

over long periods. It was Plato who first applied the Euclidean understanding to the inner world of experience. His successors, with few exceptions, have been doing the same thing. Every other kind of approach has been open to the danger of being dubbed either mysticism or religion.

The tendency in recent times has been to treat philosophy as having reference not so much to living, as to current views regarding the constitution of the physical universe. The influence of scientific progress on philosophic thinking has been very great. The mere mention of names like those of Copernicus and Darwin, to give only two, is sufficient to indicate the remarkable change which came over men's outlook, amounting almost to a *volte face* when compared with the older modes. Today it looks again as if the phenomenal advances in physics and biology, not to speak of psychology, are going to revolutionize all our thinking. The new physics has done away with the time-honoured conceptions of matter as the familiar old substance, of space and time. The last two have been fused together into a new dimension called space-time and we learn of the possibility, at least mathematically, of worlds in more dimensions than four. The old feeling about the continuity of energy is giving way before the new Quantum Theory. Ether has already been abandoned, and in place of the etheric waves which were supposed to be the structure of energy we have now mere "waves of probability", whatever that may mean. To crown all, we have the Principle of Indeterminacy which says that the motion of an electron cannot be observed without disturbing it and that we can experimentally determine either its position or velocity at any instant, but not both. This does away with the old determinism of science, and the much-vaunted laws of nature are now being interpreted as mere statistical averages. The mechanistic-materialistic views which so confidently held the field not so very long ago are already being discarded. Scientists like Eddington and Jeans believe that the ultimate stuff of the universe may be akin to mind-stuff. Their speculations have been described as being on the verge of falling into the abyss of mysticism, the *bete noir* of the orthodox scientist.

From the other side, psychology has steadily gone on extending the scope and function of the human psyche. Advanced thinkers like Dr. Jung believe that there is actually a collective psyche which is objective and common, and which ingresses into the individual psyche, although ordinarily unconscious. He says, "A high regard for the unconscious psyche as a source of knowledge is by no means such a delusion as our Western rationalism likes to suppose. We are inclined to assume that, in the last resort, all knowledge comes from without. Yet today we know for certain that the unconscious contains contents which would mean an immeasurable increase of knowledge if they could only be made conscious." The affinity between these conclusions and much of ancient Indian thought is very striking. Far from deeming them a danger we ought to welcome them as a belated step in the right direction. These pioneers are themselves aware of this. Thus Jung has in more than one place expressed his admiration for the range and profundity of Eastern thought. Regarding Einstein,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

a recent distinguished Gifford lecturer exclaims, "How clearly the Orient speaks in this man! . . . ."

Eastern thought never forgot the close connection subsisting between psychology and philosophy: the mind as the stepping stone to ultimate reality. As the *Gītā* puts it—*buddheḥ paratas tu saḥ*. The aim of philosophy was to grasp that which lay beyond *buddhi*: *evam buddheḥ param buddhvā*. This was the self or *ātman*. Philosophers succeeded in themselves in resolving the original dichotomy of subject and object (*puruṣa* and *prakṛti*) into the indivisible unity of the Self and rested content in that ineffable experience—*ātmanyevātmanā tuṣṭaḥ*. Philosophy was ultimately based on the statements of those who had succeeded in realizing the self, on *śruti* and *āpta vākya*. It was not an appeal to reason or argument, *hetu vāda*. Reasoning and inference were given only subsidiary importance because it was felt at every step that differing but equally plausible conclusions could be drawn from the same set of facts. Hence reasoning was employed only by way of illustration and was recognized as convenient reasoning or *yukti*. The process of reasoning or inference from known facts was called *anumāna*. Its root meaning is philosophically of the greatest interest and importance. The term signifies that which follows *māna* or measurement. Such *māna* or impersonal measurement has been the basis of physical science, and is in its essence a process of abstraction. It gives a measure of relative knowledge which is comparative and critical. But abstraction destroys for the mind the concrete wholeness of experience. Hence the *Upaniṣad* equates the process of measurement with destruction: *miter apīter vā*.

Reasoning and language are inextricably bound up together and language itself becomes the principal instrument of abstraction. The view of reality which is given by *māna* and *anumāna* by breaking up its integrity has been called *māyā*, meaning an abstraction in the first instance and from the ultimate standpoint an illusion. The systematic employment of *māna* and *anumāna* has yielded science and philosophy in the West. It is the merit of Indian thought to have recognized the relativity of both.

Whereas in the study of the external world by methods of impersonal measurement and mathematical analysis the self was reduced to the barest minimum and practically deprived of all specific content, in India the process was, so to say, reversed. The attention was all centred on the direct apprehension of the uniqueness of the self, to the almost complete neglect of the external world and its amenities. The stress was entirely on the immediacy of living known as *bhāva*, felt experience, the relationship of *bhāva* to scientific fact being somewhat like that of Bergson's *duree real* to clock-time. The objective of philosophy was not truth which is a logical relation, but existence itself. It is often forgotten that the word *sat* in Sanskrit does not mean truth but existence. Existence is not other than *bhāva*: as the *Gītā* puts it succinctly—*nāsato vidyate bhāvo, nābhāvo vidyate sataḥ*. The problem of philosophy was to distinguish *bhāva* from its antithesis. This distinction had to be realized through being, the root *bhu*, from which *bhāva* is derived, meaning "to be". This process was *bhāvanā*, a mode of living-understanding. The true philosopher was one who had grasped the essence of *sat* through *bhāvanā*. He was the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

real *tattvadarśin* and his knowledge was *tattvajñāna*. All the rest was mere verbiage.

Philosophy was thus closely connected with life. To start with, it was a discipline—*sādhanā*—an experimental method. Modern science and civilization owe their very existence to the development of the experimental method. The West has been so much impressed by this that a reputed scientific writer asserts, "The great intellectual division of mankind is not along geographical or racial lines, but between those who understand and practise the experimental method and those who do not understand and do not practise it." But it has been understood and practised in the West hitherto only for taking the measure, as it were, of the physical world. It is only very lately that the possibility of its application to psychology has been seriously considered. The halting experiments made in this sphere have been mostly restricted to the observation of behaviour objectively under mechanically imposed and recorded conditions. Experimental psychology has been hanging on to the apron strings of the physical sciences. That psychology may require an approach of its own, and that it is in the region of the self alone that any valid psychological experiments can at all be conducted with any hope of profit, is yet far from being realized. The necessity for such methods is only slowly dawning on the minds of a few outstanding thinkers. Thus H. G. Wells, commenting on the popularity of views like those of the Behaviourists which claim to dispense with all introspective methods, observes, "None the less, there is in fact no other method save introspection by which we can study conscious processes as such. All other methods merely deal with the physical facts of behaviour associated with conscious processes. To study the increased production of adrenalin in anger, or the possible alteration of blood-pressure or electrical conductivity during intellectual concentration, is of extreme importance; but it does not take us any farther in our knowledge of the conscious processes of emotion or reasoning. For the study of these we must continue to rely upon self-observation; so that one of the crying needs of psychology at the moment is for an improved technique of introspection."

Even this admission does not go far enough. The stress is still on a technique, something standardized and mechanical. But the individual personality is the core of the problem in psychology, which is in its essence qualitative and not quantitative. More depends on the personality of the experimenter than on the technique. Or rather, the technique has primarily to be adapted to the limitations as well as the aptitudes of the experimenter, the *sādhaka*. Hindu experimental psychology therefore started with a study of the subtle components of the psychic equipment of the experimenter. These were called *saṁskāras*. These determined what his aptitude or *adhikāra* was. Apart from *saṁskāra* and *adhikāra* there is no possibility of any advance in the region of mind. It is a recognition of this fundamental fact that accounts for the multiplicity of options in method that are permitted in the orthodox systems of mind-control like *yoga*. Thus, after explaining a number of alternative modes of contemplation, the *Yoga Sūtra* sums up comprehensively—*yathā abhimata dhyānādvā*: "or by any congenial mode of meditation."

Yoga itself was but one of the methods of *sādhanā*. The whole field of religion and mysticism and even daily life abounds in *sādhanās*. East as well as West, ancient and modern, civilized and barbarous, have all something to show in the shape of *sādhanā*. We may be sure that every system of ritual however crude embodied in itself something of psychological value, something worthy of attention and respectful consideration at the hands of the psychologist and philosopher. This is not yet realized by the so-called scientific mind. But it was one of the primary axioms of Indian thought. When Śrī Kṛṣṇa says in the *Gītā*: "By whatever path men may try to reach Me, by that I reveal Myself to them, for all paths are Mine," it is only a paraphrase of the immortal truth of the Veda—*Ekam sad viprā bahudhā vadanti*: Existence is one only, but is capable of being interpreted variously. Not only the Hindu *sādhanās*, but also the mysteries of the ancient religions all the world over, the observances of the Chinese *Tao* and the Japanese *Zen*, the ceremonials of the Christian Church, the symbols of the Gnostic philosophy, the practices of the alchemists, all these have a message for us if only we approach them with understanding instead of contempt.

We cannot avoid referring here to so-called supernatural phenomena akin to telepathy and spiritualism which have formed the subject-matter of psychical research in recent times. The opposition direct and indirect which such studies have had to encounter has been stupendous. Yet they have made some headway.

Although the results have not been very appreciable, in quantity or quality, owing mainly to a faulty mode of approach, it is beyond doubt that even the modicum of accepted fact is sufficient to give us food for thought. According to our present theory of knowledge they should not occur at all. So, even one proved occurrence is enough to require revision or even abandonment of the whole theory. As Schopenhauer insisted on long ago, "The phenomena under consideration are incomparably the most important among all the facts presented to us by the whole of experience from a philosophical point of view; so it is the duty of every man of science to get acquainted with them and to study them throughly." Yet as Mr. MacNeile Dixon asks (Gifford Lectures, 1937—*The Human Situation*), "How many of them, and how many of our divines are, in respect of this study, like the professor of Padua who refused to look through Galileo's telescope lest he might see what he did not wish to see, who dreaded its revelations?" He goes on, "But what we prefer, like or dislike, alters nothing in nature. Palatable or unpalatable, we must accept whatever lies in the path of our destiny. And if a tenth, a hundredth part of what competent observers in this field report be true, the castle of our thought may need rebuilding from its foundations. Simple people talk glibly of telepathy, for example, yet if extra-sensory perception alone were established the whole scheme of modern thought crumbles to ruin. It would be nothing short of a scientific revolution. Science and philosophy would be under the necessity, for them a sad necessity, to seek new concepts for the interpretation of reality,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

to redraw their antiquated map of the human mind."

We may now revert to the topic of *sādhanā*. The test of a *sādhanā* was not so much whether it looked rational or conformed to any external standard, but whether it delivered the goods, whether it led to *siddhi* or not. Making every allowance for superstition and quackery and routine observance, there is ample reason to believe that *sādhanā* was fruitful. But *siddhi* was not a uniform experience; it varied according to the individual and his objective. We have heard much about tangible *siddhis* like levitation, and occasionally come across experiences in ourselves or others which indicate that such results cannot be ruled out as impossible. In fact these intermediate *siddhis* were all realizable and their name was legion. However, from the standpoint of philosophy or the search for wisdom they were only so many obstacles. They were like the sirens in the story of Ulysses. Unless the seeker had the courage and disinterestedness to spurn them and forge ahead, he would get entangled in their coils and never be able to extricate himself.

The real aim of all *sādhanā* was the attainment of wisdom through *citta śuddhi*—the purification of the mind. It must however be remembered that this purification was not identical with the objective of puritanism or conventional morality. No doubt some kind of restraint and orderliness—*yama* and *niyama*—were necessary, but these were only the beginning and not the end-all and be-all of *sādhanā*. The goal was emotional and intellectual equilibrium—*samatva*—which allowed wisdom to shine forth of itself by making the mind a transparent medium. The vision was called *samadarśana*, a reconciliation and harmonizing of apparent antinomies. It was not to be attained by dissecting experience into the pairs of opposites like good and evil. For those who were bent on attaining the whole, there was obviously nothing to be gained, in Maeterlinck's words, "in shutting out the world, though it be with walls of righteousness". As the *Gītā* says, the Supreme Being takes no account of good and evil—*nādatte kasya cit pāpam, na caiva sukṛtam vibhuḥ.* But for those who have succeeded in dispelling the illusion caused by relative knowledge *Jñāna* like the glorious sun reveals the Supreme—*teṣām ādityavat jñānam prakāśayati tat param.* It is interesting to note that in a fine series of verses beginning with *amānitvam*, *Jñāna* is actually identified with humility, unpretentiousness, abstaining from causing pain, forbearance, uprightness, service to the teacher, steadiness, self-control and so on, and *ajñāna* or ignorance is laconically defined as "whatever is other than this", *ajñānam yad atonyathā.*

Enough has been said to bring out the intimate and necessary connection between wisdom which is the goal of philosophy, and actual living. Some other general considerations may now be touched upon. *Sādhanā* was not a mechanical process. It partook of activity as well as quiescence according as was felt to be appropriate. Experience cannot be manufactured, although fortunately we can draw close to it. Effort and will have something to do with it, but not everything. The will has to play hide-and-seek, functioning and yet prepared to abdicate the moment its presence is likely to prove a nuisance. The ways by which the living experiences could be

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

approached could hardly be called "methods" in the ordinary sense. The very word has a wooden and deadening effect. The path to realization was anything but a clever trick. It was rather a venture to be undertaken with one's whole being. The besetting vice of humanity has however been the sticking to the body of a method and letting the spirit ooze out. It is the hugging of outworn methods which have ceased to have any meaning or vitality that has brought all *sādhanā* into discredit. There is reason to believe that at one time the great method of *yajña*, for example, became a mere methodology—*karma mimāmsa*—which its exponents the *nānyad astīti vādinaḥ* of the *Gītā*, flaunted in season and out of season to the exclusion of all else. The teachings of the *Upaniṣads* as well as of Buddhism seem to have been the natural and healthy reaction against this obscurantist attitude. This tendency towards hypostatization of a method until it becomes a prison for man's spirit has manifested itself variously in history. The scholastic philosophies in Europe as well as in India are instances of the crystallization of methods and the consequent stagnation of the creative imagination. At present we are watching the deification of the scientific method. As Whitehead says, "The obscurantists of any generation are in the main constituted by the greater part of the practitioners of the dominant methodology. Today scientific methods are dominant, and scientists are the obscurantists."

The next point of interest is the relation between language and philosophy. The true function of language was always felt to be intermediary. It was helpful up to a certain point, but afterwards had to be eliminated. Language gave a symbolic and representative knowledge which was entitled to weight but not to finality. It was a commonplace of our philosophy that the highest experiences were beyond the power of language to express or communicate. Language was no more than the scaffolding necessary for the building of the spirit, but destined from the first to be pulled down in time. So philosophy did not revel in the growth of an endless literature. It was more concerned with the cutting down of words to the barest minimum, until one was left not with libraries but only a few *tattvas*. It was this tendency towards condensation which incidentally accounts for that unique literary form of India—the *sūtras*—knowledge in tabloid form. The number of *tattvas* was not dogmatically laid down, any more than the number of steps in a staircase, and their provisional nature was never lost sight of. It is greatly to the credit of Indian philosophy that there is comparative agreement between the various schools as regards the *tattvas* to start with, and about terms in general, which has greatly contributed to mutual comprehension and solidarity of thought, even when ultimate conclusions differed. The crucial word *tattva* cannot be adequately translated as category, being something qualitatively different and more intimate. Nor are these *tattvas* abstractions like the universals of Western philosophy. The word literally meant "itness" or "thatness" which was to be appreciated through being. As the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* puts it—*tasyābhidhyānād yojanāt tattvabhāvād bhuyaścānte viśvamāyā nivṛttiḥ*—"by intense meditation on the supreme? *tattva*, by the effort to assimilate

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

it and finally by complete identification, one gets over all relative experience". The word *tattva-bhāvād* is noteworthy as bringing out the close connection between *tattva* and *bhāva*, which I should say is the keynote of Indian philosophy—the link between philosophy and living.

A sympathetic understanding of the Indian attitude will also explain away the common charge against Indian philosophical writers that instead of writing original works they spent all their energies in writing commentaries on the works of older writers. This was inevitable because every thinker felt it his first duty to relate his thought to the experience of the great thinkers of the past. It was based on a desire, perhaps only partly conscious, that philosophy ought to present an organic body of thought never severed from its roots. The Hindu thinker was at all times more conscious of indebtedness than of his own originality. His whole life was one prolonged acknowledgement of indebtedness. The idea behind the *panca mahā yajñas* was that of the discharge of spiritual debts. The Hindu thinker was convinced that originality builds only on indebtedness. For that matter, there has been no original author at all in India. The mighty Vyāsa, the archetype of all authors, to whom we owe the Vedas and the *Purāṇas*, was, as his very name indicates, only a compiler. Sūta who transmitted the whole *Purāṇic* lore stands for a joiner. Śankara, the greatest among Indian philosophers, did not deem it beneath his dignity to be only a commentator at his highest. No wonder that lesser authors have hesitated to claim originality for themselves. If only we can get over our lately borrowed notions, we shall see that India

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

has in essence lost nothing by the fact that her best thinkers chose to write commentaries instead of setting out on their own. It is only a formal loss, if at all.

Coming back to the topic of language, the philosophic process was one gradual elimination of language. I am afraid modern professional philosophers will not like this, for it means that, like Othello, they will soon find that their occupation is gone. Like the *ūrdhva mūla adhaśśākha aśvattha* of mythology, the tree of language had to be cut down unflinchingly before the next step could be taken. All schools are agreed about this, Hindu as well as Buddhist. Silence was the condition precedent to the higher philosophy—the *parā vidyā*, and the seeker had to become a *muni* or *mouni*, the man of silence *par excellence*. The Indian imagination has been greatly impressed with the fruitful and eloquent silence of the Guru, which has the strange effect of clearing of the doubts of the pupil. As in poetry and music and even in impassioned conversation, the pause and the silence often count for more than the uttered word. The idea was shared by Buddhism also. Thus we have the "Āryan silence" of the *piṭakas*, the appreciation of silence more than eloquence in teachers, and above all the reference to the famous silences of the Master himself. The ultimate realization was in silence. In the noble words of Rabindranath Tagore, "But there, where spreads the infinite sky for the soul to take her flight in, reigns the stainless white radiance. There is no day nor night, nor form nor colour, and never, never a word!"

But it will be said, this is mysticism and not philosophy. It must be confessed that the distinction is not easy to maintain, especially in the later stages. Philosophy and mysticism may be compared to the two disciplines which the *Gītā* refers to, the *Sānkhya* and the *Yoga*. The goal to be reached by following either of them is the same, and the two are in essence one:

> *Yat sānkhyaiḥ prāpyate sthānam tad yogair api gamyate*
> *Ekam sānkhyanca yoganca yaḥ paśyati sa paśyati.*

But when we say this, it is not an admission that reason and understanding have nothing to do with it, and that it is an entirely arbitrary emotional experience that we have in view. That is never the case with Indian mysticism, if we can use that word at all. Here discrimination and understanding have a function to perform till the very end. It is not a mush of emotion, but a sharpening of the *buddhi*. The *ekāgra buddhi* was the key to realization, and the process was primarily called *buddhi yoga*. Even in the penultimate stage of meditation in Patanjali's scheme, the *dharma megha samādhi*, discrimination did not cease to function; in fact it was the only thing that functioned: *viveka khyāti*. The *Yoga* thus gives no less prominence to the discriminating reason than do the avowedly rational and philosophical systems of the *Sānkhya* and the *Vedānta*.

There has been much misunderstanding regarding the nature of the goal of the philosophic quest as conceived in India, as shown for example by the epithet "quietism". It cannot well be described either as quietism or activism, being a category by itself which includes and transcends both these modes. In our terminology, it lies beyond the three *guṇas*, but is nearest to *sattva* which is qualitatively different from the delusion and inertia of *tamas* on the one hand, and the passion and activity of *rajas* on the other. *Jñāna* is not a homogeneous vacuity, but it comprehends the fivefold experience, being firm and enduring like the earth, fluid, purifying and sustaining, and maintaining its level of equanimity like water, destroying for its possessor—*jñānāgni dagdha sarva karmāṇam*—all the dross of action like a blazing fire, vital like the *prāṇa vāyu*, and free and unbounded like space itself. It comprehends all these and extends beyond them. Even when quiescent—*Śiva*—on the surface, it hides a dynamic reality — *Śakti* — underneath just as apparently inert matter is made up of electrons incessantly radiating energy. It is not necessarily bound up with any particular mode of experience or way of life. *Samādhi* has thus been described as *sārvabhaumaś cittasya dharmaḥ*—a fundamental function which underlies all planes of the mental life. It is not necessarily a trance condition but is quite consistent with the active life as the whole teaching of the *Gītā* goes to show. The active normal life can itself be made the stepping stone to realization—*svakarmaṇā tam abhyarcya siddhim vindati mānavaḥ*. It consorts with life and experience at all levels. There is nothing that can negate its reality. It was not an academic quest or a mere ideal, but one bound up with the innermost core of living, and attainable here and now. It was not merely realizable but was actually realized: *bahavo jñāna tapasā pūtā madbhāvam āgatāḥ*.

The relation between philosophy and living is like that between *Śiva* and *Śakti* who cannot be thought of as separate from each other. They are effective only in

State Museum, LUCKNOW.

union. This combined entity it is that mythology and the needs of worship have pictured as the Divine Mother, as *Śiva-Śaktyaikyarūpiṇi.* She is philosophy, the primal *vidyā* and Her essence or *svarūpa* is vitality and life *caitanya*, both intimately linked up with the *buddhi* or discriminative understanding. May She enlighten our understanding and vouchsafe to us philosophy in living: *sarva caitanya rūpām tām ādyām vidyām ca dhīmahi buddhim yā naḥ pracodayāt!*

HAS INDIA AT PRESENT ANY "PHILOSOPHY" AS SUCH OF HER OWN?

THAT is the question asked by Mr. V. Subrahmanya Iyer in an article with the same title which was published in the *Triveṇi* and almost simultaneously in the *Review of Philosophy and Religion* in 1940. His answer at the close of the article is also in the form of a question: "In a word, is there, at present a single school of thought in all India that could be called 'philosophy' in the modern sense of the term?" I am not aware if so serious a charge and challenge has been examined or answered in any of our journals. What follows is an attempt to test the consistency of the material furnished by the learned writer and to see how far the charge is tenable. The form of the article is indeed very unusual, consisting as it does of a string of no less than sixty-five quotations from European and American writers, of which fifty-three have been numbered serially by the writer, the rest being scattered throughout the body of the article.

He begins with an extract from a letter from Swami Siddheswarananda (now in Europe) in which the Swami observes, "The European mind is constituted in a different way and our aim should be to understand sympathetically that mind. Only after two years I am able to understand that the words we use, taken from their language to convey our ideas do not bring to them the same implication that we give them." Mr. S. illustrates this by showing that the word *buddhi* has been translated into at least nineteen different words in English by different writers and proceeds to examine "what we in India are to understand by the European and American word 'philosophy'". The analogy is however not apposite. The difficulty of understanding Indian philosophical terms on the part of Westerners is obviously due to the fact that Indian philosophy is not read by them in the original but only in translations, which naturally fail to convey the exact sense of the originals. On the other hand, Indians read Western philosophy in the original at least in English and have before them material which is identical with what is available to English and American writers and readers. If the English word "philosophy" had been interpreted variously by Indian writers, as for example the word *buddhi* has been by Westerners we should have expected Mr. S. to show how Indian writers have understood it variously. Instead, he proceeds to give extracts from Western writers to show what "philosophy" means to them, and attempts to show that there is a general consensus of opinion on the point, which is altogether a different matter. But such as it is, we may see to what extent he has succeeded.

But before doing so, we may deal briefly with some of his preliminary quotations purporting to be valuations of Indian philosophy by contemporary writers, none of them of any particular eminence. It is rather amusing to see him at the very beginning of his paper relying on an article in the *Times Literary Supplement* (authorship not mentioned) as "the latest and one of the most authoritative pronouncements". A good sample of the quotations is from Jacob's *Hindu Pantheism*: "The system of *Vedānta* is rightly charged with immorality.... What results could possibly be expected from a system so devoid of motives for a life of true purity?" This for a system which makes selflessness and the renunciation of desire, and the observance of rigid purity the very *sine qua non* of a seeker and equates the quest itself with *brahmacarya*! Mr. S. quotes with approval a statement from M. Masson-Oursel's *History of Philosophy in the Orient*: "Our Western methods of research have sought to find in them a value apart from their practical value, *i.e.*, a value of truth." If a conclusion like Jacob's is the result of the modern method of research, we can only hope that India may be saved from such methods, for has it not been said "By their fruits ye shall know them?" It would not be worth our while to try to refute the charge. Fortunately there have been saner minds and methods among Westerners. It is refreshing to recollect the oft-quoted statement of Schopenhauer, surely a star of the first magnitude in the European philosophical firmament, regarding the doctrine of the *Upaniṣads*: "It is the fruit of the highest human knowledge and wisdom, and contains almost super-human conceptions, the originators of which can hardly be regarded as mere mortals. . . . It is the most profitable and elevating reading that (with the exception of the original text) is possible in the world; it has been the solace of my life and will be that of my death." Again, Paul Deussen, one of the greatest among Western orientalists, held that the *Upaniṣadic* thinkers had acquired "if not the most scientific yet the most intimate and direct information of the last secret of all being". How then shall we account for these diametrically opposed views on the same facts? Is it not possible that the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

"modern" method for all its airs of critical scholarship is unable to keep out prejudice; and that its invocation of the names of science and reason is in vain? If in the last resort, an appeal were to be made to authority, would not Europe itself give more heed to Schopenhauer and Deussen than to Jacob and his "modern" method?

A familiar charge against the Indian mentality is that it is only too prone to rely on authority. Mr. S. evidently is no exception to this rule, even when he is ostensibly putting forth a plea on behalf of the modern scientific outlook and methods. He quotes the Marquess of Zetland with approval as "one who has studied Indian culture on the spot as a Governor of a great Indian Province" and who yet denies the existence of philosophy in India as such. He goes on to add "Some well-known and thoughtful scholars as for instance Professor Edgerton, have declared Indian thought to be 'primitive' or 'magic' philosophy, or as something meant to make men seek caves and mountain tops or some mysterious powers. Some have characterised it as pig-trough philosophy!" It is strange that Mr. S. should accept all these indictments at their face value. He does not pause to examine how much of truth and validity there may be in them, and to what extent they may be due to prejudice or temperament and to that fundamental misunderstanding of the terms and ideas of an alien language and philosophy, to which he himself has referred at the commencement of the article. On the other hand, he at once proceeds to generalize in a sweeping manner that it is no wonder many colleges in India have abolished this course of study, that the authorities of the Indian Civil Service

Examination have dropped the subject altogether and that so few journals of any reputation take any serious notice of the work of Indian Philosophical Congresses and Conferences.

We may now proceed to consider the main body of fifty-three numbered quotations, whose theme, of course, is: what should be the relation of philosophy to the sciences? One would have naturally expected to see in the list the names of great physicists, astronomers and mathematicians, men like Einstein, Eddington, Jeans, Max Planck and Schroedinger who have not only revolutionized our ideas regarding the structure of the Universe but have themselves made brilliant contributions to philosophy. Strange to say, they are absent. Nor do we find the names of any great chemists, or biologists who have made excursions into the philosophical field, like J. B. S. Haldane and Julian Huxley. We do not even find the names of any philosophers of originality and note, barring some exceptions which will be referred to later. We look in vain for the names of Bergson or Earl Russell and a host of others. On the contrary, we are regaled with copious extracts from writers mostly of the text-book status, *e. g.*, fourteen from Paulsen, and seven from G. T. Patrick; some of whom would claim for science more than the scientists themselves would dream of. In spite of all this special pleading, Mr. S. fails to show that there is any consensus of opinion as to what exactly should be the relationship between philosophy and the sciences.

In order to simplify the issues, we may at the outset state that on some aspects of the question there is not

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

much scope for disagreement; as for instance when Prof. MacMurray says, "The eternal questions (of philosophy) wear a different face in different generations." The face they present today has undoubtedly a scientific complexion. Philosophers can not only not afford to ignore it, but must even account for it. Philosophy and science must go hand in hand at least for part of the journey, and there is reason to believe that they are doing so. As A. Wolfe puts it, "One of the most interesting features of contemporary philosophy is the renewed co-operation between men of science and philosophers." We may even go further with Viscount Samuel and say, "Philosophy frankly accepts the conclusions of science as its starting point", an idea reiterated by Paulsen, Ryan and, with a difference, by Broad and Taylor.

The key-note of the article is however furnished by the extract from Durant Drake, "Philosophy is the interpretation of knowledge through the synthesis of all the sciences." The definition from the *Century Dictionary* is more or less to the same effect. Mr. S. seeks to support it by a number of citations of which the following are typical: J. Moore, "All philosophers of any importance now fully recognize their dependence on Science" and again, "Philosophy is entirely dependent on the sciences". And "Only that which is scientifically verifiable supplies the entire content of philosophy"—a statement attributed by Mr. S. in one place to Dewey and in another to Robinson. Indeed, Paulsen would go further and assert, "Whatever is not in accord with this thought is outside the sphere of philosophy." Here we may heartily join issues. In the words of Prof. J. L. Stocks, "The striking discoveries of the scientists and their cumulative achievements have made such an impression on the modern world that men have often been tempted to think that there is no truth but science; and if this were so, there would be no room for philosophy. It is just because science represents but one of many contacts with reality that philosophy is needed; and for the same reason philosophy is neither a synthesis of the sciences nor itself a science." Comte's old positivist view that philosophy is nothing but a synthesis of the sciences was popularised in England by Mill and Herbert Spencer. It is an eminently Victorian conception, and in the extracts cited by Mr. S. we hear an echo of Tyndall's famous Belfast Address in which he claimed that science alone was competent to deal with all man's major problems. It is very far from representing the outlook of modern scientists and philosophers. "The reason is," says John Laird, himself a philosopher of note, "that the more developed sciences at the very moment when their prestige stood higher than ever in the world, became themselves distrustful of their own finality." Consequently we may safely say that the definition of the *Century Dictionary* of 1888 has decidedly fallen out of vogue with philosophers as well as scientists today. It is at least half a century behind the times, to quote Mr. S's own charge against Indian Philosophy.

Modern philosophy then has its own sphere and method. It is only partially true that "Philosophy has never flourished except in alliance with the sciences": but assuredly it has also never flourished "when it was prepared to plod humbly after them". Philosophy is no

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

longer content to be the handmaid of science. Several of the extracts given by Mr. S. support this view. Thus A. E. Taylor has said "The work of the philosophy of Nature and Mind only begins where that of experimental science leaves off". In the words of J. A. Sullivan "Its task is to correlate the conclusions of the sciences with those which may be reached in the course of the practical, ethical, and æsthetic or religious experience". Or as C. D. Broad has put it, "The object of philosophy is to take over the results of the various sciences, to add to them the results of the various religions and ethical experiences of mankind and then to reflect upon the whole". Finally we have it on the authority of Whitehead, one of the few really big modern names quoted by Mr. S., "that it brings to its task not only the evidence of the separate sciences but also its own appeal to concrete experience". This is an orientation which differs radically from that of the older positivist school.

It makes a whole world of difference as to whether philosophy is understood to mean "certain kinds of more or less completely systematised knowledge of the sciences," as Mackenzie has it; or with Whitehead and others, as covering life and experience as a whole, and not merely the schematic knowledge of certain measurable aspects of reality dealt with by science. The methods also would vary accordingly. Let us see what the authorities cited by Mr. S. have to say regarding the method of philosophy. Towards the end of his paper he gives the following extract from Goethe: "Be but contemptuous of reason and science, the highest gifts of man, and you have given yourself up to Satan." In his conclusion, our author asks, "Or shall we give ourself up to Satan?" On the face of it, the answer is clear—most assuredly not. But the matter is not so simple as it looks. Reason and science cannot be thought of as words whose content is specific and on which there is general agreement. Philosophers as well as scientists have understood them variously. Goethe shows his wisdom in speaking of reason *and* science. He does not equate them. He was aware, although perhaps dimly, that there was an implicit conflict between their methods and outlooks. Mr. S. and some of his authorities do not however seem to be aware of this. M. Masson-Oursel is all for reason. Says he, "This Worship of reason has created a philosophical literature to which there is no corresponding one, or at least to which anything corresponding did not arise till very late in the East." John Lewis froths at the mouth when he advocates an "honest and irresistible train of reasoning". Frank Thilly says, "It (philosophy) makes reason the highest authority." But historians of science are now practically agreed that the great "historical revolt" which preceded the establishment of the modern scientific method was not by any means an appeal to reason. "On the contrary," as Whitehead says, "it was through and through an anti-intellectualist movement. It was the return to the contemplation of brute fact; and it was based on a recoil from the inflexible rationality of medieval thought." Of the Greek thinkers too, Whitehead has said, "Their minds were infected with an eager generality. They demanded clear, bold ideas, and strict reasoning from them....But it was not science as we understand it... Their genius was not so apt for the state of imaginative muddled suspense which precedes successful inductive thinking." The method of reason thus differed entirely from that of science.

One would therefore expect that scientists and philosophers who took the cue from them would be suspicious of reason as such, and would not miss any chance to decry it. It is seen that the majority of authors quoted by Mr. S. are as a matter of fact no exception to this, in spite of occasional lip-service to Reason with a capital R. Says Ritchie "That the philosopher can somehow spin his philosophy out of what he finds in himself, that he has some internal source of information in virtue of which he can decide what the universe must be, without needing the trouble to look at it, dies hard." Wundt is quoted as saying "Fruitless endeavours were made to spin philosophical systems out of a few general concepts—subject, nature and mind, being and becoming." For Paulsen, academic philosophy is no more than "the sophistical practice of speaking of all things in general with a certain air of sense and reason. Its professors are jugglers who produce all sorts of obscure and profound oracles by the promiscuous use of general concepts, to the amazement of a lot of idlers" and "A *purus putus metaphysicus* (a pure metaphysician) is a chimæra or an empty babbler", a sweeping condemnation dragging into its range every great name in philosophy, from Plato and Aristotle, Descartes, Spinoza and Liebniz, Kant and Hegel down to the present day. And finally MacMurray clinches the whole by asserting, "Academic Philosophy like academic Art is nearly always dead."

Unlike M. Masson-Oursel, these authors then are no "worshippers of reason". On the contrary, they claim to be devotees of science and the scientific method. Mr. S. quotes the weighty plea of William James for the extension of the methods of science into the fields of human relations and human problems. On examination however, this resolves itself into not so much a direction to philosophers, as an appeal to scientists to turn "the tremendous intellectual power exhibited in scientific thought and research" into spheres other than those to which they have been narrowly restricted hitherto. To come to more recent writers, we have G. T. Patrick telling us: "Philosophy is the attempt by the use of scientific methods to understand the world in which we live." "Philosophy is like science in seeking that which is certain, exact and well-organized." "No progress in philosophy can be made if we commit ourselves to some fond theory." "The method of philosophy is to see life steadily with neither prejudice nor bias nor half-knowledge." And Thilly is convinced that the particular concern of philosophy should be with the sciences of external nature and with the examination of natural things. To him the gaze turned inward is anathema, as dealing with "supernatural things". These statements deserve our careful scrutiny.

Is there such a thing as Science, unitary and homogeneous, with comparable identities in method and certainties in achievement? At the outset, we are faced with a great variety of sciences—each with its own method, and with results of very unequal validity. The science *par excellence* is mathematics, but it moves admittedly in a world of abstractions. Its successful application has been possible only to the simplest aspects of nature. Hence a science, *e.g.*, physics dealing with these aspects became highly systematized at a very early stage. No doubt, the application of mathematics to physics was based upon observation. But observation means selection, for after all, we need only attend to those aspects of concrete experience which lie within some limited scheme. Any such scheme of abstraction, if its success is sufficiently wide, becomes difficult to get over and we get bound in its coils. As Eddington, one of the foremost exponents of the philosophy of modern science has said, "We have found that where science has progressed farthest, the mind has but regained from nature that which mind has put into nature", a conclusion which Kant had already arrived at by *a priori* reasoning. In fact, as Bertrand Russell has shown, a mathematical web of some kind can be woven about any universe containing several objects. "If this be so," says J. W. N. Sullivan, a popular writer on science, "then the fact that the universe lends itself to mathematical treatment is not a fact of any philosophical importance."

Science of this type is really a closed system. These systems have been described as "automatic thinking machines for which mathematics and logic are, as it were, the rules and instructions. In such a deductive system as mechanics, for example, it is through the definitions employed that the parts of the symbolic system are linked together, so that a given manipulation of the symbols will yield comparable results even when their precise nature is not foreseen by their manipulator. Thus for such systems there comes to be something which is regarded as *the* definition of a particular symbol. Given the system, there will be one and only one definition of a symbol, which is the right or proper definition, in the sense that the working of the system depends upon the employment of this definition." "The narrow efficiency of the scheme was the very cause of its supreme methodological success" in Whitehead's words. But even in its own limited sphere, the progress of science has reached a turning point. The old foundations of scientific thought are becoming unintelligible. Time, space, matter, material, ether, electricity, mechanism, organism, configuration, structure, pattern, function, all require re-interpretation. Whitehead draws the inevitable conclusion that the old assumptions which have held the field undisputed so long are entirely unsuited to the situation at which we have now arrived.

So much for the mathematical sciences themselves. When we come to the field of biology, the inadequacy of the approach so successful in the physical sciences becomes at once apparent, with the consequence that "the most obvious and fundamental problems of biology are not even approached". Speaking of the application of the notions of physics and chemistry to life, Whitehead says, "The brilliant success of this method (in its own sphere) is admitted. But you cannot limit a problem by reason of a method of attack." Yet this is exactly what orthodox biologists have hitherto been attempting to do. It is beyond doubt that the progress of biology and psychology has been checked by the uncritical assumption of the half-truths which have held easy sway in the inanimate sphere. Even more than biology, the fate of psychology is an illustration in point. It is indeed in a very rudimentary state, so much so, that many deny that such a science exists. There is certainly no generally accepted body of psychological doctrine. There are a number of different theories, each having a limited range of application and, where they profess to deal with the same phenomena, differing profoundly from one another.

It will therefore be obvious that speaking of "Science" the "Scientific Method" in contexts outside their immediate sphere of application is an example of loose thinking of a dangerous type, and a very unscientific subterfuge. By hypostatizing the word, to use the terminology of the latest comer into the scientific arena, Semantics, it has been deprived of its legitimate "reference" and has only an emotive or irritant function. There is nothing inevitable about science. The actual course which science has taken has depended largely on the types of mind which as historical accidents have risen to the level of genius at favourable instants. Literally the scientific method is utterly inapplicable to philosophy because science starts with a prejudice in favour of the measurable and elicits only a half-knowledge. Philosophy, if it is to justify its existence is concerned with a whole, only part of which is amenable to science and reason. It would be suicidal to equate philosophy with science in seeking that "which is certain, exact and well-organised". That may be left to science. No progress in philosophy is indeed possible if we commit ourselves in advance to the "fond theory" that the course of philosophy and science should run parallel. Scientists themselves are not claiming that

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preseyation Foundation, Chandigarh

it should be so. Here is what a scientist has to say on the point, "Science has become self-conscious and comparatively humble. We are no longer taught that the scientific method of approach is the only method of acquiring knowledge about reality. Eminent men of science are insisting, with what seems a strange enthusiasm, on the fact that science gives us but a partial knowledge of reality, and we are no longer required to regard as illusory everything that science finds itself able to ignore."

Philosophy is concerned with the question "What is the ultimate truth about ourselves?" Science may answer that we are bits of stellar matter gone wrong, or that we are chemical marionettes. But as Eddington says, "There is one elementary, inescapable answer. *We are that which asks the question*. . . . This side of our nature is aloof from the scrutiny of the physicist." That is philosophy's central problem. It is a problem which concerns not the professional philosopher only but every thinking man. An extract given by Mr. S. shows awareness of this: "Consciously or unconsciously every man frames himself a theory of the relation of the individual to the universe, and on his attitude to that question, his whole life and conduct, public and private depend"—E. Wallace. What is the contribution of Western philosophy to this problem, especially after the application of the much-vaunted scientific method? In all conscience nothing appreciable. It has yielded no certainties at all. On the other hand, evidences of disparity are rapidly growing. "It would certainly seem that many philosophies today treat other philosophies not as brothers or even as enemies, but as untouchables." As a great modern intellectual, Aldous Huxley, quoted by Mr. S. himself, has put it, "Philosophical arguments are mostly angry shoutings at one another by two who use the same words but mean different things." Philosophic language is also developing a pseudo-scientific technicality. As Laird says, "Among certain types of philosophers, the normal attitude appears to be one of complete linguistic isolation. Each seems to say to the other, 'I do not want to talk with you unless you take the trouble to learn my language.' Moreover the menacing part of the situation is that many of these languages are exceedingly difficult to learn, not to speak of the circumstance that they rapidly become out of date." One would expect that at least at the Universities where the sciences are flourishing, philosophy also would thrive in that stimulating company. But alas, it is not so. Ginsberg makes the confession, "Philosophy at the universities has become a museum speciality, a display of lifeless systems and concepts." So much for the practical result of the application of the scientific method to philosophy.

We may now summarise the position. The progress of science has greatly influenced thought in the West, especially systematized thought or philosophy. But the consequences of the application of the scientific method or rather of its analogy, for the method itself is not literally applicable to philosophy, have not only not been fruitful, but have even resulted in harm. There has been no general agreement as regards the relation which ought to subsist between science and philosophy. The claim that Science should dominate philosophy, which used to be put forth on behalf of the scientific materialism rampant during the second half of the nineteenth century is no longer being pressed. Science seems to have turned over a new leaf, and even to be going back on its tracks. As a recent writer has said, "The whole outlook has changed and is changing. The materialistic and mechanistic views of the last century, encouraged and strengthened by the biological discoveries of Darwin, are giving place to speculations which are in danger of falling into the abyss of mysticism." Although this may be somewhat overstated, it is beyond doubt that the limitations of science are being clearly realised, and by none so much as by the scientists themselves. Philosophers are following suit, but naturally with a certain "lag", the principal laggards being text-book philosophers of the type mainly relied on by Mr. S. They seem to be still hugging doctrines based on scientific theories "which have now to be cast into the limbo of outworn beliefs". India has nothing to gain by following their lead, as Mr. S. would have us do, and donning Europe's cast-off clothes.

The ignorance of some of these "philosophers" outside their own narrow speciality is colossal and matched only by their arrogance. Some more quotations from Mr. S. will make this clear. Paulsen would set philosophy in definite opposition to the mythico-religious notion. For John Lewis, the mystic's vision is "the very antithesis of honest reasoning, and a piece of presumptuous dogmatism". Poussin crowns the whole; "You may rid Hinduism of its immense load of nonsense and consider it to be a sort of mystic positivism; yet it is incredible

State Museum,
LUCKNOW.

illusion to pretend to find in it anything of use." It is rather late in the day to start proving for the benefit of such writers, that India has a philosophy of her own. It does not cease to be philosophy because it does not conform to certain definitions selected by Mr. S. We have seen what these definitions are actually worth, enclosing as they do "a wilderness of idea in a wall of words". In philosophy, as in other matters, India must follow her own genius. That does not mean that Science has no message for us. The fullest use may be made of it, provided its limitations are not lost sight of in the glamour of its success. Science is a good servant but a bad master. Science is intended for man and not man for science. It is this latter outlook which has brought disaster on the world today. In Aesop's fable of the man and the donkey, science is the donkey which should be ridden on, and not carried on the shoulders. For those, especially philosophers, who in the name of science and the scientific method, would deliberately avoid all other avenues of knowledge, Nemesis is lying in wait. The only reply to them is in the famous words of Oliver Cromwell, "My brethren, by the bowels of Christ I beseech ye, bethink ye that ye may be mistaken!"

THE CONCEPT OF *ŚAKTI* IN THE VEDA

THE word *Śakti* means energy. Power or force is conceived as the active principle in the universe, and is personified as a goddess. From the primordial *Śakti* every other form of activity proceeds. Under many different names it is worshipped as *Devī* or the Mother. As Woodroffe says "God is worshipped as the Great Mother, because in this aspect God is active and produces, nourishes and maintains. But this is for worship. God is no more female than male or neuter. God is beyond sex ...... the Power or active aspect of God the immanent is called *Śakti*. In her static transcendent aspect the Mother, or *Śakti*, is *Śiva*, or the Good. That is, philosophically speaking, *Śiva* is the unchanging Consciousness and *Śakti* is the unchanging Power appearing as mind and matter."

The concept of the Great Mother as such does not appear in the *Ṛgveda*. It is however ever-present as an underlying *motif* or base. The great active power, as it were, chooses to remain in the background and is diffused among the attributes of the gods, among which as Macdonnell says "the most prominent is power". The gods "regulate the order of nature and vanquish the potent powers of evil. They hold sway over all creatures; no one can thwart their ordinances or live beyond the time they appoint; and the fulfilment of desires is dependent on them. They are benevolent beings who bestow prosperity on mankind; the only one in whom injurious traits appear being *Rudra*. They are described as 'true' and 'not deceitful' being friends and protectors of the honest and righteous, but punishing sin and guilt." It is interesting to note that all these characteristics have been described together in a *Sūkta* of the *Ṛgveda* addressed to *Vāk* which later tradition has designated the *Devī Sūkta*, and which is used in connection with the *pārāyaṇa* of *Saptaśati*.

In a few hymns of the *Ṛgveda* which Western scholars classify among the later hymns, the deities *Aditi* and *Prajāpati* are identified not only with all the gods but with nature as well. They partake of all the attributes characteristic of *Devī*. *Aditi* is an abstract deity whose shadow is over the whole Veda. With her rests the power of delivering from the bonds of physical suffering and moral guilt. She literally signifies liberation and freedom. Her antithesis *Diti* meaning bondage is mentioned as a goddess three times in the *Ṛgveda*. Even in the *Ṛgveda*, *Aditi* is spoken of as the mother of the group of deities called the *Ādityas*. It is entirely in keeping with the spirit of the Veda that the *Purāṇas* speak of *Aditi* and *Diti* as the wives of Kaśyapa from whom respectively were born the *Devas* and *Asuras*. *Aditi* and *Diti* would thus seem to stand for those groups of qualities which have been described in the *Bhagavad Gītā* as *Daivī* and *Āsurī Sampat* and summed up finely as follows: *Daivī sampad vimokṣāya, nibhandāyāsurī matā*: the *Daivī* qualities lead to liberation while the *Āsurī* qualities make for bondage.

Going back to the *Ṛgveda*, one of the very first references to *Aditi* runs as follows: *Aditir dyauraditir antarikṣam āditir mātā sa pitā sa putraḥ, Viśvedevā aditiḥ panca* *janā aditir jātam aditir janitvam.* "*Aditi* is heaven; *Aditi* is the firmament; *Aditi* is mother, father and son; *Aditi* is all the gods; *Aditi* is the five classes of men; *Aditi* is generation and birth." Mystic and profound reference is made to *Aditi* in a well-known hymn of the *Ṛgveda* (X. 6. 4). The following is a sample: "*Dakṣa* was born from *Aditi*, and afterwards *Aditi* (again) from *Dakṣa*. *Aditi*, who was thy daughter, O *Dakṣa*, was born; after her the gods were born adorable; freed from the bonds of death." Commenting on the verse, Roth says: "*Dakṣa*, spiritual force, is the male power which generates the gods in eternity." The mutual derivation of the gods from each other is frequently described in the Vedas and in later mythology. For a proper appreciating of this, it is essential to bear in mind the explanation given in the *Nirukta* that all the gods have the same origin and derive their substance from one another (xi. 23). The scanty notices of *Dakṣa* which appear in the *Ṛgveda* have been greatly developed in the *Purāṇas*.

The other deity endowed with cosmic energy and qualities is *Prajāpati*. He is often identified with *Dakṣa*. Thus it is stated in *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*: "*Prajāpati* alone was all this universe in the beginning. He performed sacrifice. He himself is named *Dakṣa*." He has also been identified with *Viśvakarman*, *Hiraṇyagarbha*, *Brahmaṇaspati*, etc. The celebrated *Sūkta* containing the refrain *Kasmai devāya haviṣā vidhema* is a fine example of a hymn addressed to *Prajāpati*. The refrain has often been translated as: "Let us offer worship with an oblation to the divine *Ka*." A better alternative would be: "To what God shall we offer oblation?"

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preseyation Foundation, Chandigarh

Incidentally, reference may be made to some of the well-known cosmic hymns in the *Ṛgveda*. There is first the famous *Nāsadīya Sūkta*. Among others of great interest are: the one addressed to *Brahma Jñāna* and the *Sūkta* beginning *asya vāmasya*. This last is a very remarkable hymn, the longest in the whole of the *Ṛgveda*. It is full of cryptic utterances which if comprehended would supply the key to much that is puzzling and obscure in the Vedas and *Purāṇas*. Thus a verse has it: "What is in reality female has been called male: he who has eyes beholds; the blind seeth not. . . ." Allusion may be seen in all these to the qualities of *Devī*.

The case of the *Gāyatri* is an illustration in point. *Gāyatri* is really the name of a Vedic metre of 24 syllables, but it is specially applied in ritual usage to a verse in that metre addressed to the male Vedic deity: *Savitṛ*. The verse itself (*Tat savitur vareṇyam bhargo devasya dhīmahi dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt*) preceded by *OM* and the three sacred syllables or *Vyāhritis* (*Bhūḥ*, *Bhuvaḥ* and *Suvaḥ*) is considered the most sacred in the whole Veda and is often referred to as the Mother of the Vedas. Yet tradition deems it as addressed to the goddess *Gāyatri* who is described as having five faces and ten hands. She is considered to be the embodiment of the fivefold worship or *Pancāyatana Pūja*, the weapons she carries in her hands being symbolic of *Gaṇapati*, *Viṣṇu*, *Śiva*, *Śakti* and *Sūrya*, the five great deities of *Purāṇic* worship. No foreigner nor even a Hindu without the proper traditional background would ever dream of singling out this casual verse addressed to a minor deity in *Ṛgveda* as the most sacred in all religious literature. Yet such is its importance when judged by criteria which are not visible to the eye, that the *Devī Bhāgavata Purāṇa* makes out the worship of *Gāyatri* as the most fundamental form of *Devī* worship and describes its *Sahasranāma, Stōtras*, etc., at great length. The *Purāṇa* itself begins with a verse which is only a classic paraphrase of the *Vedic Gāyatri*: *Sarva caitanya rūpām tām ādyām vidyām ca dhīmahi, buddhim yā naḥ pracodayāt.*

Another case in point is that of the *Sūkta* commencing: *Jātavedase.* This happens to be the shortest hymn in the whole of the *Ṛgveda*, consisting of only one verse. It is addressed to *Agni Jātavedas* and may be translated as follows: "We offer oblations of *Soma* to *Jātavedas*; may he consume the wealth of those who harbour enmity against us; may he transport us over all difficulties: may *Agni* convey us as in a boat over a river, across all wickedness." *Purāṇic* tradition however considers this as the *Vedic mantra* of *Durgā*.

On the whole, goddesses do not play a very important part in the *Ṛgveda.* The most noteworthy is *Ushas* goddess of the dawn, the most poetically beautiful creation of the *Ṛgvedic* hymns:

> In the sky's framework she has shone with splendour;
> The goddess has cast off the robe of darkness.
> Wakening up the world with ruddy horses,
> Upon her well-yoked chariot Dawn is coming.

Macdonnell is of opinion that her charm is "unsurpassed in the descriptive lyrics of any other literature". Then come the Waters which are praised as goddesses in four hymns. Next comes Sarasvati who is celebrated in two whole hymns and in parts of others.

As a specimen may be given the following three verses.

> "May Sarasvati the purifier, the bestower of food, the recompenser of worship with wealth, be attracted by our offered viands to our rite. Sarasvati the inspirer of those who delight in truth, the instructress of the right-minded, has accepted our sacrifice. Sarasvati makes manifest by her acts a mighty river, and (in her own form) enlightens all understandings."

Among other goddesses *Vāk* has already been referred to. Then come *Rātri*, *Pṛthvi* and a host of minor ones including the rather vague and shadowy wives of the gods. The hymn to *Rātri* needs special mention, as it is used as a subsidiary in the worship of *Devī*. In this connection, the following extract from a paper by Brij Lal Mukherji on the *Vedas* and *Tantras* will be of interest: "For purposes of attaining eternal bliss they worshipped *Rātridevī* who is described as a girl growing into womanhood and who bestows happiness. She has long and flowing hair, has in her hand a noose. If she is pleased, then all other *Devas* are pleased. She being pleased offers boons, but the worshipper must reject the same and then he will gain freedom from rebirth. This is the worship of *Ràtri*; it requires no fasting and must be performed at night. The *Mantra* to be recited is the *Rātri Sūkta* which commences with *Rātri vyakhyad* to be followed by *Ārātri pārthivam rajas*. The *Ṛg Vidhāna Brāhmaṇa* which follows the *Sāma Vidhāna Brāhmaṇa* declares that the *Rātri Sūkta* must be recited and the worship must be performed as a *Sthālipāka Yajña*. *Rātri* is substantially the same as, but in form different from, *Vāgdevī*; and they are sometimes worshipped as one and the same. The *Rātri Sūkta* describes her as black. The portion of the *Rātri Sūkta* which is included in the *Khila* portion of the *Ṛgveda* calls *Rātri Devī* by the name of *Durgā* and this *Mantra* appears in *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*. The *Brihad-devatā* also mentions that *Aditi*, *Vāk*, *Sarasvati* and *Durgā* are the same." Combining various references like this, the author concludes: "We have the almost complete form of a *Devī* who is called at the present day by the name of *Kāḷi*." Such a conclusion is however open to the criticism that the various strata of the Veda are ignored and the identifications are often forced and unconvincing.

It is unnecessary however to have resort to forced explanations, because it is not the name and particular form that are to be looked for, as is done by modern critical scholarship, but the substance. This substance or essence is undoubtedly in evidence throughout the Veda, and indeed forms its warp and woof. The position can best be summarised in the words of the *Saptaśati* which is a veritable gospel of *Devī* worship. It is said there: *Nityaiva sā jaganmūrtistayā sarvam idam tatam, Tathāpi tat samutpattir bahudhā śrūyatām mama*: "Although *Devī* is ever-present in the very form of the Universe which is pervaded and upheld by her, yet her specific appearances can be explained in a variety of ways." And again: *Devānām kārya siddhyartham āvirbhavati sā yadā, Utpanneti tadā loke sā nityāpi abhidīyate.* "Although she is eternal, she is spoken of as manifesting herself only when she does so on behalf of the gods." When the gods are in all their glory and receiving their due sacrifices there is no cause for the appearance of *Devī*. It is only when they are ousted from their proper sphere that she appears, forming for herself a body composed of the energies residing in the various gods. Her challenge to the hostile powers is *Trailokyam indro labhatām devāssantu havirbhujaḥ.* "Let *Indra* become supreme again in all the three *lokas* and let the *Devas* become recipients of their due *Yajña-bhāga.*" When this object is accomplished *Devī* or *Śakti* disappears again. But how? It is said in the *Saptaśati*: *Tatraiva antaradhīyata*—She merges herself in the form and nature of the several gods. This is what has happened in the *Ṛgveda.*

THE GENIUS OF THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE *

A STUDY IN MYTHOLOGY

It would appear as if the spirit of Indian culture clothed itself in an appropriate form, and that form was the Sanskrit language. The body of the language perhaps came from outside of India as in the *Ṛgveda*. But it was so fashioned after its advent as to become the natural vehicle of the spirit of India, of her art and her culture: in fact of all her *Saṃskāras*. It became *Saṃskṛta*. The relation between the spirit and the vehicle is like that between *Śiva* and *Śakti*—an *avinābhāva sambandha*. This *Śakti* is principally to be apprehended as the genius of the Sanskrit language. The mode of approach in what follows will be through the field of mythology and not that of linguistics. Before the genius or *Śakti* will unfold herself she has to be propitiated. Let us start with praise: Sanskrit is the mother of all our languages, the repository of our culture and the treasure-house of our cherished dreams and visions. Like the stream of the holy Gangā rising in the snow-capped peaks of the Himalayas and flowing through vast and fertile plains on to the sea, the river of this Sanskrit whose remote source we have not the temerity to explore, flows past our homesteads and fields sustaining and purifying our workaday life and leading us without haste, and almost unknowingly to the very shore of the Infinite. Even those who have lived on the banks of other streams, in the evening of their lives resort to the banks of this sacred river which is replete with the veritable waters of life. When all other streams dry up, this alone, fed by the melting snows, overflows its banks, self-sufficient and perennial.

---

* Inaugural Address delivered before the Sanskrit Association of the Maharaja's College, Mysore, in 1936.

How did this stream first come down to us? We are told that *Bhagīratha* made her descend from heaven after untold efforts and that she purified several generations of his ancestors. Is this a symbol of the Herculean efforts we have to make in order to master this language, and how when once we have succeeded, the recompense exceeds our fondest hopes? I believe it may be. We will pursue our simile. When *Gangā* descended from heaven, we are told that she came down with such force that nothing could withstand her impetuous torrent. Then the mighty *Śiva* received it in the coils of his matted hair, and allowed only a chastened and manageable stream to flow down to this earth. Can it be that this mighty torrent was the Vedic Sanskrit which was received by the spirit of India, and converted into the clear and pellucid stream of the classical language? Who was this *Śiva* who sobered and restrained the rude energy of the Vedic language? Many interesting conjectures have been made in this connection. Some Western scholars have told us *Śiva* is a Dravidian god who was adopted into the Āryan or Vedic pantheon. Nowadays we are not so sure about Āryan and Dravidian, nor are we prepared to accept the naive chronology according to which bands of Āryans filtered down into India across the mountain ramparts about 2000 years B.C. The discovery of the Indus valley civilization in the excavations at Harappa and Mohenjo Daro has very considerably put back the hands of the clock. But even in this ancient civilization, there is ground to believe that the worship of *Śiva* was the most popular of cults. So whether Dravidian or not, the cult was peculiarly Indian whereas the Vedic cult, as we can make out from the affinities with the Avestan religion and language, as well as from other evidence, had its sources outside of India. *Rudra*, who is now identified with *Śiva*, was in the *Ṛgveda*, a comparatively minor god. Out of 1,028 hymns in the *Ṛgveda*, only three entire hymns are addressed to him. On the other hand, when we come to the *Yajurveda* we find that *Rudra* has already come into his own and occupies a pre-eminent position. He has become *Mahādeva*. We have there the famous litany known as the *Rudrādhyāya* or *Śatarudrīya*, the most well-known of all Vedic passages. Its sacredness was recognized long ago and it was even elevated to the position of an *Upaniṣad*. We have also other *Upaniṣads* referring to it. Thus we see in the *Kaivalya Upaniṣad*: *Yaḥ śatarudrīyam adhīte so-gnipūto bhavati*, etc. In the *Śvetāśvatāra* which is one of the major *Upaniṣads*, we find for the first time that the Supreme Person is identified with *Rudra*. It is significant that this *Upaniṣad* forms part of the oldest section of the *Yajurveda*, *viz*., the *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda*. Now there can be no doubt that the *Yajurveda* is a purely Indian growth and adaptation. So we may safely venture to assert that the Indian soil was congenial to the development of the minor *Rudra* of the *Ṛgveda* into the supreme *Rudra* of the *Yajurveda*, who is no other than the *Śiva* of later mythology.

This position of pre-eminence does not seem to have been won without a struggle. There is the famous myth of the destruction of *Dakṣa's Yajña* by *Śiva.* The word *Dakṣa* is very significant. It means: able, competent, expert, clever, skilful, fit, eligible, careful, attentive, prompt, honest and upright. In mythology we see that *Dakṣa* has been described as the embodiment of all these qualities so anxiously sought after by the Vedic worshippers. This is all very good. How then did any enmity come about between this *Dakṣa* and his own son-in-law *Rudra*? This very question is asked by *Vidura* of *Maitreya* in the *Bhāgavata.* In order to understand the answer we have to examine the nature of *Rudra.* Macdonnell writing about the *Ṛgvedic* gods, says: "They are benevolent beings who bestow prosperity on mankind, the only one in whom injurious traits appear being *Rudra.*" This *Rudra* was feared and misunderstood. He was first kept apart and ultimately ignored. That was the seed of the catastrophe. There was a certain terrible divinity in man, apparently inimical to the well-fed and prosperous daily life, yet potent with the promise of the highest good; and man's temptation was to banish this from his endeavours, and worship exclusively those obvious good qualities symbolised in *Dakṣa.* So, all the gods were invited to *Dakṣa's Yajña* except *Rudra.* Then came the reaction, and with a vengeance.

In the myth, *Rudra* is described as the ascetic or *Yogin par excellence.* He scorned the delights which men ordinarily hanker after. That is really the crux of *Dakṣa's* complaint against him: that he is not worldly minded—*Sadbhir ācaritaḥ panthā yena stabdhena dūṣitaḥ.* "This misguided person has the hardihood to condemn the course approved by the best among us." So *Dakṣa* cursed him, saying that *Rudra* should go without his share of worship. He was not invited to *Dakṣa's* sacrifice. *Rudra's* spouse *Sati* went there uninvited, was treated with contumely and she immolated herself in the sacrificial fire.

Before doing so, she addressed reproaches to her father, the purport of which is somewhat as follows:—The path of *Dharma* comprises both *Pravṛtti* and *Nivṛtti*. In your arrogance you think that only the former is *Vaidik* and not the latter. As a protest, I give up this body of mine born from you, so that I may manifest again with a form worthy of *Śiva* who is the very embodiment of *Nivṛtti*. Then as Kālidāsa puts it:—"The chaste *Sati*, the daughter of *Dakṣa* and the former wife of *Bhava*, who driven by the insult offered by her father to her lord had abandoned her body by means of *Yoga*, resorted to the mountain's consort (*Mena*) for rebirth." It would appear as if this *Sati* who was one of the younger daughters, in fact the sixteenth daughter of *Dakṣa*, voluntarily abandoned her former body and was born again in a form wholly dedicated to *Śiva*, is no other than the Vedic language transforming itself into Sanskrit.

It is not suggested that the content of this ancient myth is exhausted by this interpretation. It has also to be added that throughout what follows the word *Śiva* is used without any sectarian significance. On the other hand, the phenomenon of the destruction of *Dakṣa's Yajña* by *Śiva* has many parallels in and out of India. Thus it would appear as if the Avestan reaction against the Vedic gods in ancient Iran, and the Buddhist protest in India

State Museum,
LUCKNOW.

against the sacrificial and ritualistic excesses of Vedic worshippers were both variations of the same *motif*. The triumph of early Christianity too, with its ideals of renunciation and self-sacrifice, over the sensual orgies of the religions of Greece and Rome, was no other than the victory of *Śiva* over *Dakṣa*. In our own day, do not the life and teachings of Gandhiji point in the same direction?

We have referred to *Śiva's* spouse or *Śakti* and suggested that she is no other than the genius of the Sanskrit language. Very appropriately she has been depicted as *Mātṛkā varṇa rūpiṇī*. It is said that each letter of the Sanskrit alphabet has a *Śakti* of its own. The *Śakti* which represents the language itself is composite of these several *Śaktis*. This *Ādi Śakti* has been worshipped in India under two distinct aspects: *Durgā* and *Lalitā* These again appear to be personifications of the Vedic and classical languages. In the *Ṛgveda* we have a hymn beginning *Aham Rudrebhir*. It is throughout in the first person and is said to be the *Ātma stuti* or self praise of *Vāk*, or Vedic speech. *Vāk* is both the *Ṛṣi* and deity of the hymn. The very first *mantra* is a sample of contents:—"I proceed with the *Rudras*, with the *Vasus*, with the *Ādityas*, and with the *Viśvadevas*; I support both *Mitra* and *Varuṇa*, *Agni* and *Indra* and the two *Aśvins*." There can be no doubt here that it is the Vedic language that is thus apostrophised. Now this hymn has been called the *Devī Sūkta* and used in the ritual worship of *Durgā*. Thus *Durgā* and the Vedic *Vāk* are, as it were, one and the same.

In a later Vedic *mantra* She is described as "*Tām agnivarṇām tapasā jvalantīm*, etc." as of the colour of fire and blazing with *Tapas*. In the *Purāṇas*, she figures very largely under the name of *Durgā*, as well as *Caṇḍikā* and a host of others. A whole *Purāṇa* known as the *Devī Bhāgavata* is dedicated to her. Among smaller passages, may be mentioned the famous episode in the *Mārkandeya Purāṇa* known as the *Caṇḍi-pāṭha* or *Durgā Saptaśati*, which is as important an ingredient in the worship of *Durgā* as the *Śata Rudrīya* is in the worship of *Śiva*. In this *Saptaśati* She is described as the compounded essence of the energy of all the gods, fierce yet propitious. She is still unwedded: *Kumārī* or virgin. She has not found her mate or master as yet. This is what She proclaimed to the *Asuras* who aspired for her hand:

Yo mām jayati sangrāme, yo me darpam vyapohati,
Yo me pratibalo loke, sa me bhartā bhaviṣyati.

"He who conquers me in battle, he who humbles my pride, he verily who is my equal in all respects, he alone shall be my husband." We see here the same combativeness and energy and pride which we noticed in the Vedic *Devī Sūkta*, as being characteristics of the Vedic language.

But when we come to *Lalitā* we find that things are changed. *Lalitā* means easy, gracious. These are indeed the marks of the classical *Bhāṣā*. Lest it be said that an unorthodox meaning is being imported it may be stated that this significance was well-known to the seers and users of the symbol. Thus there is the *Lalitā Sahasranāma*, so greatly prized by devotees all over India. The *Ṛṣis* or seers of this are appropriately said to be the *Vāgdevatās*; and the *Bīja* or mystic seed is the *Vāgbhava* *kūṭa.* That speech or language was one of the principal aspects to be kept in mind is therefore obvious. Again in the body of the *Sahasranāma* we come across the epithets *Bhāṣārūpa* and *Vāgvādini.* But what kind of *Vāk?* She is described as *Komalākāra*—tender of form. The old fierceness has disappeared. It cannot be a mere accident that throughout the thousand epithets of the *Sahasranāma* there is no mention of *Tapas.* On the other hand she is called in one place: *tāpatrayāgnisantaptā samāhlādanacandrikā.* "She is like the cool healing rays of the moon to those who have been burnt up by the fire of the three kinds of *Tāpa*" which means heat as well as affliction. In the place of *Tapas* we find numerous references to *Yoga.* Thus She is dubbed *Yoginī, Yogadā, Yogānandā,* etc. The names link her to *Śiva* also. Thus we find her described as *Śiva, Śiva-jñāna-pradāyinī* and *Śivapriyā* which are almost parallel to the three already cited, as if the connection with *Yoga* and *Śiva* are synonymous. The untamed *Kumārī* has already found her mate and master. The untempered force of *Tapas* has become the balanced energy of *Yoga.* She who at first was a comparative stranger to *Śiva* has become his bride and his beloved: the Vedic language has mellowed and ripened into the Sanskrit *Bhāṣā.*

It may perhaps be objected that language has been presented to us in mythology as *Sarasvatī* and not under these two particular forms described here. But then, myths are not mutually exclusive. Like our own private and individual dreams these myths are the dreams of the race—mind, in which the entities merge and interpenetrate in a most surprising fashion. The physical law that no two things can occupy the same place at the same time, does not hold sway in the world of dreams. Thus we are told in the *Upaniṣad* that it is a somewhat different Self that experiences dream. This Self has been designated *Taijasa* whereas the Self of the waking life has been named *Vaiśvānara*, which latter perhaps means "man in the visible universe". It is said that each of these has seven limbs and nineteen faces but while the *Vaiśvānara* is outward conscious and experiences the gross physical world, the other is inward conscious and experiences the subtle world: *antahprajña* and *pravivikta bhuk*. The latter is really of a higher order than the former (*utkarṣād, ubhayatvād*), because although the gross world is not present in the dream life, the dream state is present during wakefulness, otherwise all our visions and highest aspirations and imaginations would lose their value and significance. It may be said that it is the *Taijasa* self that created all these prolific myths, it is to this Self that they are appropriately addressed and it is this Self alone that can understand them. Much of the misunderstanding and contempt that has been showered over the myths of the *Purāṇas*, interpreting them literally as having reference to the hard world of our waking life, could have been spared if they had been treated as having validity and value only in their own special sphere. Alas, we have not had that patience. But it is never too late to mend and the disease has not advanced so far as to be considered incurable.

Let us go back to *Sarasvatī*. She has been called *Vāṇī* or speech or sound, and depicted in mythology as the spouse of *Brahmā*. *Brahmā* with his four faces is accepted as the very embodiment of the four Vedas. His four faces face the four directions, the cardinal points of the compass. We read in the *Purāṇa* that once *Brahmā* had five faces, the fifth facing upward. Owing to a curse he lost the fifth face. This seems to have much to do with the curious fact that there is no formal worship of *Brahmā* through the length and breadth of India. Except at Mount Abu there is no temple to *Brahmā* anywhere. Why is this? Perhaps one reason is that *Brahmā* looks only in the four worldly directions but not in the upward (spiritual) direction. He had the upward aspect once but lost it, and with it lost his claim to be worshipped. Now mythology says that *Śiva* has five faces. This would indicate as if the ideal of the Supreme Person at one time came to be imaged exclusively with reference to worldly things, including of course what was meant by *Svarga*, and the better sense of the nation had to abandon it, as being neither whole nor wholesome. In fact, the complete ideal with five faces which was once the object of worship as *Brahmā*, had metamorphosed itself into our old friend *Dakṣa*; and his supremacy had to be destroyed by *Śiva*, who for the purpose of that story was the fifth face personified. With the dethronement of *Brahmā*, *Sarasvatī* has shared his fortunes. It is not that *Sarasvatī* is not worshipped in India today. She is, but only as a manifestation of *Devī*. Thus she is worshipped on the sixth day during the *Navarātri* festival dedicated to *Devī*. It would appear therefore as if Speech was once sacred and catered to the complete needs of man. Then it became the exclusive handmaid of the worldly-minded and lost its place, but subsequently managed to secure a relatively subordinate position in the pantheon.

Sarasvatī would again stand for any language, whereas we may claim with pardonable pride that *Devī* alone stands for Sanskrit. *Dakṣa* had numerous daughters. To vary our symbol, these daughters may be the various sister languages of the Indo-Āryan group. Among them, Sanskrit was that *Satī* who chose *Śiva* for her lord. This is indeed so in the spirit. Evidences need not be multiplied, but reference may be made to a suggestive instance. Kālidāsa is admittedly the greatest poet whom India has produced. We are told that, to start with, he was an ignoramus. He became an ardent devotee of *Devī*, whom he adored under the form of *Kāḷī*, and by Her grace became a great poet. Why should this be interpreted crudely and the young poet imagined as a rude rustic rubbing the skin off his finger tips while grinding sandal paste in the dark shrine of the goddess? Can it not rather mean that out of his great devotion to the Sanskrit language imaged as *Devī*, he acquired his poetic mastery? This actually appears to have been the case. For, apart from his well-recognised works, a number of highly devotional *Stotras* to *Devī* are attributed to Kālidāsa. These undoubtedly look as if they are addressed to the personified image of the genius or *Śakti* of the Sanskrit language, for example, the *Śyāmalā Daṇḍaka*.

The name *Śyāmalā* means dark and is more or less identical with *Kāḷī* or black, as commonly understood. These epithets suggest the answer to another objection which might be raised against our present mode of approach, *viz.*, that Sanskrit contains atheistical writings also, *e.g.*, *Bṛhaspati* and the *Cārvākas*. How then could it be said that the genius of Sanskrit is devoted to *Śiva* alone? It contains much that is *Aśiva*. The answer is that *Śiva* himself comprises much that is *Aśiva*. Thus we have the invocation:—"O *Rudra*, we bow to all forms of yours: those which are mild as well as those which are terrible and even deadly." Very naturally his *Śakti* has corresponding aspects, but in none of them does she cease to be *Śiva-Śakti*, not even when as *Kāḷī* she is depicted as dancing on the body of *Śiva* himself. This image which is in the nature of a paradox has been much misunderstood. Its true significance could perhaps be discovered only through worship and meditation.

We may now consider an aspect of our subject which we just touched upon when speaking of *Durgā* and *Lalitā*. What was the process by which the metamorphosis was accomplished? *Tapas* and *Yoga* appear to have been the principal ingredients in this process. *Tapas* we have seen was an attribute of *Durgā* while yet a *Kumārī*, whereas *Yoga* has already taken its place when we come to *Lalitā*. Even in the process, the two steps are characteristic of the features of the Vedic and classical languages. Up to a certain point indeed they appear to be synonymous: *Tapas* is prior and leads up to *Yoga*. Thus we read in the commentary on the *Yoga Sūtra*: "For him who is without *Tapas*, *Yoga* does not fructify. In the absence of *Tapas*, the impurity consisting of the network of sense-objects confronting us, variegated by the impressions left by beginningless *Karma* and affliction cannot be dissolved."

Let us go back to the *Ṛgveda*—to its oldest portion, *viz.*, the *Samhitā* proper. Neither the word *Tapas* nor the word *Yoga* in the sense in which we understand them are to be found there. It is in the *Āraṇyakas* that we first come across the word *Tapas*. We may take it that their authors felt that they had had enough of the sense life, and they fled from it into the seclusion of the forest, to practise austerities and in solitude commune with their own selves. But much experimenting had to be done before the certainties of the *Upaniṣads* were arrived at. The results are described in symbolical language. *Prajāpati*, the embodiment of the Veda, is said to have performed *Tapas*. Even in the *Upaniṣads*, the word *Yoga* does not appear in the earliest ones. Barring casual references, we come across it full-fledged in the *Śvetāśvatāra* to which we have already had occasion to refer on account of its connection with the *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda* and the worship of *Rudra* as the Supreme Being. The opening verses of this *Upaniṣad* might well form a preamble to all the *Upaniṣads*. They place before us the eager spirit of enquiry which permeated those seekers. "The enquirers after *Brahman* converse among themselves: What cause is *Brahman*? Whence are we produced? By whom do we live, and where do we ultimately abide? By whom governed, do we walk after a rule in happiness and unhappiness, O ye knowers of *Brahma*? Is time (*Kāla*) *Brahma*, or (*Svabhāva*) the own nature of things, or the necessary consequences of action (*Karma*), or accident, or the elements or nature or the soul?" The answer follows: "Through *Dhyāna* and *Yoga* they beheld the Divine *Śakti* concealed by its own qualities, which alone superintends all those causes, of which Time was the first and Soul the last." The details as to how this *Yoga* is to be practised are given in the second chapter of this *Upaniṣad* and the results are described thus: "The body becomes light and healthy, the mind becomes free from excess of passion; purity of complexion, clarity of sound and freedom from dross are attained." That is the nature of the metamorphosis, of the acquisition of a new body through *Yoga*.

These however are the very qualities which classical Sanskrit acquired as compared with the older language. We find this same lightness and sanity; *Laghutvam* and *Ārogyam*, the same freedom from excesses of passion: *Alolupatva*, *Varṇaprasāda* and *Svarasauṣṭava*. These last two epithets are so expressive as to be untranslatable. These qualities were doubtless acquired through *Yoga* alone, and not otherwise. This was India's own contribution. This was the process and this the added significance. By way of concrete illustration, may be mentioned a few linguistic peculiarities. The acquired lightness is obvious. The development has been a process of renunciation: accent is given up, several inflexional forms are given up, as well as tenses and moods and forms of participles and gerunds and infinitives. Thus as a marked feature it is observed that out of a dozen kinds of infinitives in the Vedic language, only one survives in Sanskrit. Another feature too deserves special notice. It is the comparatively rare use of the finite verb (frequent enough in the Vedic language) for which past participles or verbal nouns are very often substituted. There is also a marked fondness for passive constructions. These tendencies grew with age and have

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

indeed been adopted as tests of age in linguistic criticism. They are very characteristic and appear to be the visible or rather audible indication that India had outgrown the adolescent craze for incessant action and had developed a wise and subdued passivity. However this might be viewed in the West, there is no doubt that according to Indian standards it was a step in the right direction. Thus we have it in the *Bhagavad Gītā*: "For the aspirant after *Yoga*, action alone is the means. But when the same aspirant is established in *Yoga*, then *Śama* or passivity alone is amply adequate." Classical Sanskrit has acquired this *Śama*, as compared with the turbulent energy of the Vedic language.

Let us see wherein *Tapas* differs from *Yoga*. *Tapas* in its very nature partakes of strenuous activity whereas *Yoga* is more of equilibrium or balance. Activity like the flow of water, demands and presupposes a difference of potential. On the other hand, equilibrium indicates balance: the water has found its level. The former is *Vaiṣamya* of the qualities, whereas the latter is *Sāmya* or *Samatva*, words identified with *Yoga* in the *Gītā*. The word *Yukta* so often used in the *Gītā* means fit and suitable and harmonius. Thus we have:

Yuktāhāra vihārasya yukta ceṣṭasya karmasu,
Yukta svapnāvabodhasya yogo bhavati duḥkhahā.

"For him who is moderate in diet and in play as well as in work, in sleep as well as in wakefulness, *Yoga* destroys all pain." In *Tapas* there may be the possibility of over-doing things, but not in *Yoga*. This is not a view peculiar to the *Gītā*, but is well-recognised in the *Yoga Śāstra* also. Thus we find in the *Yoga Bhāṣya* that if *Tapas* is to be conducive to *Yogā*, it must be such as will lead to the soothing of the mind: *tacca cittaprasādanam abādhamānenā sevyam.* Vācaspati Miśra in his *Tattva Vaiśāradi* explains this as follows:—*tāvanmātrameva tapaścaraṇīyam, na yāvata dhātuvaiṣamyam āpadyate.* "That much of *Tapas* only is to be performed as will not cause disturbance of the *Dhātus* or subtle constituents of our system." *Yoga* therefore is that repose or balance of energy supervening on a judicious and well-chosen course of moderate activity. It is the plenitude of equilibrium known as *Samādhi.*

This equilibrium is to be found in the structure as well as substance of the Sanskrit language, and more of it is to be seen in the classical than in the Vedic language. Any one reading the essays of Ānanda Coomārasvāmi or other writers on Indian Art will be struck by their insistence on the connection between Indian Art and *Yoga.* At first it may appear like an over-statement, but careful consideration will reveal the fundamental validity of the idea. Art is not to be understood merely as meaning the plastic arts or music: these are only ancillary. Life itself—the living of it, is the art of arts. The highest Indian experience of life is permeated through and through by *Yoga. Tapas* is unbalanced and inartistic. *Yoga* is balanced and is therefore the highest form of art. But experience is *Sūkṣma* and its visible or rather perceptible symbol is language: the Sanskrit language is the greatest work of art left to us by our ancestors. All the artistic *Saṁskāras* of the race have been condensed into it. It is for this reason assuredly that it has been named *Saṁskṛta.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

The connection between language and *Yogic* experience is not a mere fanciful assumption, but a deep-seated realisation. It is not for nothing that legend has it that the great Patanjali who is said to be the incarnation of *Ādi Śeṣa* was at once the expounder of *Yoga* as well as of Grammar: of the *Yogānuśāsana* and *Śabdānuśāsana*. Language is undoubtedly the sound-counterpart of experience. With India's characteristic fondness for placing the *Sūkṣma* or subtle before the *Sthūla* or gross, we refer to gross objects themselves as *Padārtha* as if the *Pada* or word came first, and the object was merely the thing signified by the world. Again, the word audibly uttered is itself gross. Behind it, it is said there are three further degrees of subtleness: *Madhyamā*, *Paśyanti* and *Parā*. This *Parā Vāk* is also referred to as *Vidyā* and is the very image of *Brahman*. This is the *Ādi Vidyā* or what is identical with it, *Ādi Śakti*. It is this *Śakti* who is symbolised as in eternal communion with *Śiva*: they are the parents of the Universe. The relation between them has been described as *avinābhāva sambandha*, like the connection between word and meaning. It is they who are praised by Kālidāsa at the commencement of *Raghuvaṁśa*.

> *Vāgarthāviva sampṛktau vāgartha pratipattaye,*
> *Jagataḥ pitarau vande Pārvatī Parameśvarau.*

It has not been possible to keep them separate in the course of this presentation. It may be that we have attributed to *Śiva* the characteristics of *Śakti* or *vice versa*. It is not our fault but their *Svabhāva*. Let us who are aspirants after *vāgartha pratipatti* offer salutation to them. And again let us bow especially to this *Ādi Vidyā* who has been called *Śiva-Śaktyaikya rūpiṇī* and whom we have tried to depict as the genius of the Sanskrit language. Let us meditate on Her who is all *Caitanya* (vitality, consciousness and intelligence), so that She may give us vision:

> *Sarva caitanya rūpām tām ādyām vidyām ca*
> *dhīmahi, buddhim yā naḥ pracodayāt!*

SRĪ RAMAKRISHNA AND THE DIVINE MOTHER*

A QUAINT belief popular in India holds that when a man of outstanding virtue passes away he becomes a star in the sky. Thus it is said that *Dhṛva* by steadfastness in devotion became the Pole Star. Round him revolve the *Sapta Ṛṣis*, the Great Bear. If we put away the crude and literal meaning of this, we at once observe that it is over our mental horizon that these stars rise and set, and it is in our inner firmament that they shine. The saints and sages of all times are there as the fixed stars. Many of them are mere specks of light to us. But that is no indication of their size or power; for astronomers tell us that some of the stars that appear dimmest to us are many thousands of times bigger than the Sun. Yet the Sun is the nearest fixed star to us and he counts for us far more than all the fixed stars in the heavens. Such appears to me the position of *Bhagavān* Srī Ramakrishna in our mental astronomy. Assuredly he has risen before our eyes as the spiritual Sun when the light of the distant stars had become dim and had almost ceased to illumine us. I will complete the comparison by adding that this Sun brought in his wake the Moon, shining, no doubt, with light borrowed from his Master, but so agreeable and stimulating and above all so much nearer to us. I refer of course to Vivekānanda. Lest it be thought that I am not doing justice to the dynamic personality of the great Swāmi Vivekānanda by comparing him to so pale and cold a luminary as the moon, I would remind you that the Moon is no other than *Soma* of the *Ṛgveda* which is referred to as *Yajñaśriyam nṛmādanam*—the grace of the sacrifice, the exhilarator of mankind—in fact that heady beverage which gave Indra his matchless strength. I would also remind you of the lines in the *Bhagavad Gītā* where *Soma*, imaged as *Rasa* or the essence of vitality, is said to be sustaining the food-giving plants. Shall we say that Swāmi Vivekānanda resuscitated with life-giving juice, the drooping plants of spirituality in the world?

---

* Address delivered at the Srī Ramakrishna Centenary Celebrations, Mysore in 1936.

My concern here is more with Srī Ramakrishna. The extent of the power which this name wields today over the minds of men is the most remarkable phenomenon of a century. India has not been lacking in saints. Yet it has not fallen to their lot to make that universal and potent appeal which is the distinction of Srī Ramakrishna. What is the secret of this? It appears to me to lie in the peculiar conception of deity which he cherished and with which he attained identity. Srī Ramakrishna worshipped this dynamic and moving world, *Jagat*, as the Divine Mother. Such was his absorption that he actually used to hold conversation with the Divine Mother. He has said, "I say to my Mother, 'Mother, I am the tool, Thou art the hand; I do what Thou biddest me say.'" He has said "When I sit at the feet of the Divine Mother, I feel intoxicated as if I have drunk five bottles of wine." Whenever the idea of the body or the finite ego would creep in, he would say, "Here (*i.e.*, within him) there are two persons. One is the Divine Mother, the other is Her worshipper. It is the second person who is now ill. Do you understand this?" To lose sight of this would be to misunderstand Srī Ramakrishna *in toto*.

We shall now proceed to examine briefly the concept of the Divine Mother which was so dear to him, and also try to clear some misconceptions. The Divine Mother is conceived as *Śakti* or *Caitanya*. *Śakti* means power, efficiency or efficacy in its broadest sense. That is the sense in which the whole world impresses us to start with. It is with us all the time. All fervour and all endeavour is *Śakti* and comes from the same source which is ultimately divine. She is *Sat* (existence), She is *Asat* (non-existence), She is everything. But two distinct tendencies are noticeable as working in the world—that which tends towards external appearances and leads to bondage and that which turns towards the inner reality and leads to freedom. The former is called *Āsurī Śakti* and the latter *Daivī Śakti*. Their qualities have been distinguished in the *Gītā*, *Daivī sampad vimokṣāya nibandhāyāsurī matā*, the one tending to liberation and the other to bondage. Although bondage and freedom both proceed from this single *Śakti*, still the Divine Mother is conceived as 'appearing' only when she starts the forces of release, the *Daivic* forces. Thus it has been said, "Though eternal, she is said to be 'originated' when she manifests herself for a 'divine purpose'." Differentiating the actions of those devoted to the *Āsurī* or deluding aspect of Nature (*Prakṛti*), Srī Kṛṣṇa has said that they embark on a multiplicity of futile hopes, futile actions, and evolve therefrom a futile knowledge and thus drain their vitality dry under the force of delusion (*Gītā*). On the other hand the *Mahātmās* are described as devoted to the *Daivī Prakṛti* (divine aspect of Nature) and to be worshipping Her with singleness of mind (*Ibid.*). Srī Ramakrishna Paramahamsa was such a *Mahātma*, in fact one of the greatest among them.

It would not be out of place to point out here that *Asuras* should not be conceived as irreligious men. We are told that Rāvaṇa was a great *Yogi*. He as well as Hiraṇyakaśipu, and practically every one of the *Asuras*, attained their greatness through *Tapas*. *Tapas* and *Yoga* are thus only the means. The main problem is, what is the objective? To which god is the oblation offered? That was the question which India asked millenniums ago: *Kasmai devāya haviṣā videma*? The alternative is mainly: is it offered to the *Daivī Prakṛti* or the *Āsurī Prakṛti*? Alas! under the influence of the prevailing tendencies we are likely to lose sight of this vital issue. The weight of great names presses down on us. Thus, true to the Western outlook, Romain Rolland himself in his *Life of Srī Ramakṛṣṇa* writes as follows: "There are many souls who believe they are free from all religious belief, but who live immersed in a state of super-rational consciousness, which they term Socialism, Communism, Humanitarianism, Vitalism or even Rationalism. *It is the quality of the thought and not its object*, which determines its source and allows us to decide whether or not it emanates from religion." Srī Ramakrishna would have emphatically repudiated such a statement because, put in brief, it merely amounts to this: "So long as you worship, it matters little what you worship." On the other hand, Srī Ramakrishna would rather have us use our discrimination, differentiate the divine (*Daiva*) from the diabolic (*Āsura*), and follow the *Daiva* at all costs. Even under *Daiva* he would ask us fearlessly to discard all shams masquerading under that name, and stick to the inner reality alone. That is his distinction.

The effect of the efflux of time (*Kāla*) is such that all energy runs down, and concepts, however vital at one time, soon cease to be such. The appearance remains but the efficacy departs. In fact the appearance itself becomes the greatest obstacle in the way of efficacy. It becomes a mass of dead tradition. To take an illustration, only the empty name of God remains, but in actual life we find as if He is powerless. We call on His name in vain, and think He is an empty shadow. We come to speak of Him decorously but for all practical purposes put Him on the shelf. He ceases to be a motive force in our life. In symbolical language, it means that *Śakti* has, as it were, departed from *Śiva*. Without *Śakti*, *Śiva* is inert, as is said in the *Saundarya Lahari*. Then *Dharma* decays and *Adharma* prevails. At such times the Lord himself assumes a form and comes down into the world of men. What for? For tending righteousness and extinguishing vice. To suck and withdraw the energy or *Śakti* from misconceptions, and to re-deposit it in the *Sādhu* or right conceptions, and to revitalise them. Symbolically it is to collect the dissipated *Śakti* and put her back in *Śiva*. That was the task for which Srī Ramakrishna came down in this *Kali Yuga*. Nobly he started it and is still accomplishing it; for such men do not die. If his frail mortal frame is no longer visible to our physical eyes, the *Śakti* or Divine Mother,

State Museum
LUCKNOW.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preseyation Foundation, Chandigarh

the very secret of his power, is there, radiant and compelling.

This concept of *Śakti* is indeed no new one. It has been revered in India through the ages. The national festival of India, the *Dasara*, is dedicated to Her. She was, I am sure, worshipped by the dark aboriginal tribes of India and was perhaps called *Kāḷi* or dark on that account. She was worshipped by the white-complexioned Āryans who perhaps preferred to call her *Gauri* or white like themselves. The white and the black are equally Her dear children. She is present in the Veda behind the numerous gods, like the power behind the throne, in the dim half-perceived figure of *Aditi*, the mother of the gods, of whom it is said, "*Aditi* is heaven; *Aditi* is the firmament; *Aditi* is mother, father and son; *Aditi* is all the gods; *Aditi* is the five classes of men; *Aditi* is generation and birth." This *Aditi* is no minor deity. The very name stands for 'liberation', 'freedom', 'the absolute' and 'the infinite'. Her main characteristic has been described as the power of delivering from the bonds of physical suffering as well as from guilt. She is frequently invoked in the Vedas as the Beyond, as what is beyond the earth and the sky, the sun and the dawn. In fact she is the most metaphysical of the Vedic deities. On this point, Max Muller was so impressed that he exclaims "this is a most surprising conception in that early period of religious thought." We may, however, say that there is no cause for surprise if we hold the Indian view that the gross is evolved out of the subtle, instead of the Western view that the subtle has been evolved out of the gross. I do not propose here to pursue further the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

other indications of the existence of the *Śakti* concept in the Veda. In fact it appears to me to be the warp and woof of the Veda.

Coming to the *Upaniṣads* which form the bedrock of our philosophy, we find the concept of *Śakti* very clearly brought out in the *Kena Upaniṣad*, which is one of the smallest of the *Upaniṣads* yet one of the oldest and most authoritative. There it is said that *Brahma* once won a great victory for the gods. By this victory the gods attained majesty and exulted among themselves. "Ours is this victory, ours the majesty," they said. *Brahman* became aware of this delusion of theirs and appeared before them as a *Yakṣa*—a spirit. They said to *Agni* "*Jātaveda,* do ascertain if this being is worthy of adoration." He replied, "Be it so," and ran up to the *Yakṣa*. The *Yakṣa* said "Who art thou?" He answered, "I am verily *Agni*. I am verily *Jātaveda*." The *Yakṣa* asked him, "What is thy power?" *Agni* replied, "I can burn whatsoever there is on earth." The *Yakṣa* placed a blade of grass before him and said, "Burn this". Approaching it with all his might, *Agni* could not burn it. He returned discomfited. Then *Vāyu* approached the *Yakṣa* and boasted of his own prowess. Again the *Yakṣa* put before him the blade of grass and asked *Vāyu* to move it; but *Vāyu* was unable to stir it. He too returned in shame. Then *Indra* himself approached the *Yakṣa*, who disappeared. *Indra* remained there rapt in contemplation. After a time the divine *Umā*, daughter of *Himavat*, showed herself to him in the sky and told him that it was *Brahman* who had won the victory for the gods, and she disclosed the real nature of *Brahman* to *Indra*. The power that resided in *Agni*, *Vāyu* and the other gods was no other than the power of *Brahman*. Divested of this power, the gods were gods only in name and could not even move a blade of grass. *Brahman* could not thus be grasped even by the gods, but His grace or *Śakti*, appearing as *Umā*, revealed Herself, that is to say, the *Svabhāva* of *Brahman* revealed itself to *Indra*, after he had learnt proper humility.

In the several *Purāṇas* this *Śakti* or *Devī* has been described in various ways, sometimes as the consort of *Śiva*, sometimes as the *Māyā* of Viṣṇu, or as *Yoganidrā* under whose influence the Supreme Person lies in deep slumber, as it were, or again as *Kāḷī* the Terrible with her garland of skulls and bloody lolling tongue, dancing on the very body of *Śiva*. This last form has perhaps been the most misunderstood of all. Yet it was in that form that Srī Ramakrishna worshipped Her. To the sophisticated, I am sure this will appear as a strange anomaly. They might perhaps like to argue it away as a remnant of superstitious obsession in a great mind, resulting from a crude upbringing. To do so would be wholly to lose sight of the very secret of the power of Srī Ramakrishna and Vivekānanda. It would be like depriving a clock of its mainspring. The semblance of a clock would alone remain but it would not work. Adequately to expound this *Kāḷī* is beyond my powers. Symbols like this have their roots deep in the subconscious mind of men, and our tiny rational fringe of consciousness, despite the magisterial airs it puts on, cannot fully appraise them. She will yield Her secret only to those who will worship Her. For the rest we may say that She is the profoundest image yet conceived by the mind of man of 'freedom from bondage'. She is the spirit of *Śiva* trampling over the mere body or form of *Śiva*. The idea is that even that which was intended for the good of man, by efflux of time (*Kāla*) becomes a source of bondage when the spirit has departed and only the traditional formula remains. The spirit has its revenge by trampling over the inert form and asserting its own supremacy. At first sight this cannot but appear a terrible act of desecration. Hence the apparently ghastly form. When however the purpose is accomplished, and freedom from the bondage of dead tradition is achieved, then a great load is lifted from man's heart and he becomes like a little child. Such was the state of Srī Ramakrishna's mind. The terrible austerities he had passed through left no mark of *ahaṃkāra* (egotism) in him. The spirit of those men who hug their austerities to heart and make it a source of pride is still under the bondage of a *Kāḷī* whom they have not the courage to conceive as trampling over traditional forms, after having drunk their blood, that is to say, sucked their essence. I do not want to dilate on this, nor can I say that the symbolism may not have a thousand other equally valid meanings, if not better. Suffice it to say that when the Divine Mother has revealed Her innermost nature to Her devotee, she no longer appears terrible but becomes the very embodiment of compassion and tenderness and beauty. As described in the *Saptaśatī*, she becomes most benign and charming—*Saumyā saumyatarāśeṣasāumyebhyastvati sundarī*.

I hope a charge will not be levelled against me that, starting with Srī Ramakrishna as my subject, I have strayed into the concept of the Divine Mother. My justification is that in the same sense as Jesus Christ said, "I and my Father in Heaven are one," so, Srī Ramakrishna and the Divine Mother are assuredly one. She is the perennial source from which his teaching and that of Vivekānanda flow like the holy *Gangā* descending from heaven. Such however is the secularising tendency of the present age that already there is a disposition to ignore the cause and hug the effect. I would emphatically say, take care of the cause and the effect will take care of itself. I do not want to minimise the value of the ethical and social side of the teaching of Srī Ramakrishna. But of late one is hearing too much about *Daridra-Nārāyaṇa* and next to nothing of *Śrīman-Narāyaṇa*. The highest ethical values and ideals of social service can surely coexist with a thorough-going atheistic materialism like that of Marx and his followers. If one should persist in taking these alone as the essence of the teaching of Srī Ramakrishna, and relegate to oblivion the deep and ever-present reliance on, and surrender to, the will of the Supreme Person, otherwise known as the Divine Mother, it will be a foolish choice. Have both if you can. If not, if you are faced with an alternative, let yours be the choice which Arjuna made when he and Duryodhana went to Srī Kṛṣṇa seeking his assistance on the eve of the Great War of the *Mahābhārata*. Srī Kṛṣṇa offered them the choice between his armed paraphernalia on the one hand, and on the other, himself unarmed and non-combatant. Arjuna chose the person of the Lord while Duryodhana thought he was making a wise and practical choice by accepting the army. The result is well-known.

That this was the view of Srī Ramakrishna, and is not something which I am reading into him, I will now show to you by a few brief extracts from his sayings.

"First install God in the temple of the heart; first realise Him. Speeches, lectures and the rest—these may be taken up after you have seen God—not before."

"If instead of preaching to others, one worships God all the time, that is preaching enough. He who strives to make himself free, is the real preacher. Hundreds come from all sides to him who is free, and are taught. When the flower opens, the bees come to it uninvited."

"You talk of social reform? Well, you may do so after realising God. Remember, the *Ṛṣis* of old gave up the world in order to attain God. This is the one thing needful. All other things shall be added unto you, if indeed you care to have them. First see God, and then talk of lectures and reforms."

"One ray of light from my Divine Mother, who is the Goddess of Wisdom, has power to turn the most learned scholar into the veriest worm that crawls upon the earth."

To attain even a single ray of light from the Divine Mother, what did Srī Ramakrishna advise? The answer is: self-surrender, solitude and prayer and meditation. The words which Buddha applied to his own teaching may almost without change be applied to the teaching of Srī Ramakrishna: "Just as the great ocean has only the taste of salt, just so has my doctrine and discipline only one flavour--the flavour of emancipation." Let this be lost sight of for a moment, and no matter what imposing array of popular activities you are taking shelter under, you will make the world look like a marriage pavilion where the pipers are playing and the guests have arrived and the feast is getting ready, but only the bridegroom has disappeared.

Now to conclude, Srī Ramakrishna went like a bee collecting honey, to every flower of religion in the world. Nay, he collected honey from everything that existed—*bhūteṣu bhūteṣu vicitya.* Unlike the bee, he drank deeply of the honey and passed on the nectar to the whole world, for his supply was endless. Such is the state of the supreme *Ṛṣis.* It has been described as follows in the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*: "The *Ṛṣis* having attained everything in the shape of their own Self, have become soaked in *Jñāna*, free from passion, and full of peace. These sages, having approached the omnipresent Supreme Being by every possible mode of access, have entered into the universe itself." Such is their nature, such the *Śakti* that dwells in these *Paramahamsas.* Where shall we find this *Śakti Śrīguruḥ sarva kāraṇa bhūtā śaktiḥ*: Take refuge in the feet of the *Guru*, and the *Śakti* will descend on you and you will be merged in bliss here and now, not elsewhere, not in a mere hereafter!

THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE *TANTRAS*

THE word *Tantra* is derived from the root—*tan*—meaning to draw out, to spread. The significance is clearly brought out in words like *tantu*: what is spun out like a thread, a strand; and *tanu*: the body, in which the spirit has spread out or revealed itself. In Hindu religious usage, *Tantra* stands for ritual in general, whether of the external variety or dealing with methods of introspection. Ritual has been called the art of religion, and most historical religions have been associated with some form or other of ritual, although the relative importance attached to it has varied greatly. The cloth of religion has been made up of the strands of *Tantra*, whatever may be the philosophical design into which the strands have been woven. To vary the image, ritualism has been, as it were, the body—*tanu*—in which the spirit of religion has most commonly manifested. As ordinarily there is no smoke without a fire, it would be in order to say that there is no ritual without religion, and wherever there is ritual, there is *Tantra*.

Going back to Vedic antiquity, it is seen that the prayer and praise which form the substance of the *Saṃhitā* or *Mantra* portion of the Vedas went hand in hand with a sacrificial scheme which has been elaborated in the bulky treatises known as the *Brāhmaṇas*. Some scholars are of opinion that sacrificial formalism was a later and rather invidious growth, while others, no less competent, maintain that it was always there and that every *Mantra* presupposes it. Without deciding for either extreme, it would be safe to say that *Mantra* and *Brāhmaṇa* were never dissociated from each other, just as in common parlance it is usual in India to use the phrase *mantra-tantra*, coupling the two words not merely on account of the superficial rhyme but presumably on account of some deeper affinity. The *Brāhmaṇas* could well be described as the *Tantras* of the Veda. It is interesting to note that the root *bṛh*: to expand or grow, from which the word *Brāhmaṇa* is derived, is allied in significance to the root *tan*: to spread out. In either case, history shows that the *Brāhmaṇas* as well as the *Tantras* expanded or spread out to such an unconscionable extent that they provoked the inevitable reaction. Indeed, religious history looks as if it were a play of opposing forces, action and reaction, the tendency of ritual to grow at the expense of the spirit and the tendency of the human spirit to keep it within bounds.

In almost prehistoric times, the Avestan schism with its pronounced ethical and dualistic bent was in all likelihood a protest against the naturalistic, monistic and ritualist trend of the Vedic religion. Within the Indian fold itself, the earliest *Upaniṣads* aimed at a simplification of ritual, and Buddhism was but one of the forms which the reaction took, and *Yoga* another. Yet the formalistic ritualistic germ seems to have got inside each one of these protests and to have had a prolific growth. From the Avestan religion were derived the semitic religions of the Middle East which developed vigorous cults and rituals of their own. The religion of Christ started as a protest against the formalism of the "pharisees and scribes", but soon settled down into the forms of the great Catholic Church with its ever-growing ritualistic tradition. In due course came the protest of the Reformation.

Indian religious history also shows parallel movements. The earlier *Upaniṣads* adopted the Vedic deities and concepts for purposes of esoteric meditation. It was at this time that the method of *Pratīkōpāsana* was brought into being. But soon there came up a mass of *Upaniṣads* dealing exclusively with *Yoga* and ritual, *Mantra śāstra* or *varṇa sādhana*, as it is often called in the *Tantras*. This was however no alien growth. We have it on the authority of Prof. S. N. Das Gupta that this *Varṇa Sādhana* which forms such a large portion of the content of the *Tantras* was not a creation of the *Tantra* but only a development of the *Pratīkopāsana* which was first attempted in the age of the *Araṇyakas*, and that the *Tantras* merely combined the Vedic teaching with the *Yoga* method and elaborated the result. The evolution of Buddhism too was on similar lines. The teaching of the four noble truths which form the core of primitive Buddhism had already developed into a cult and ritual in the *Hīnayāna*. Dr. Waddell, an unsympathetic critic, derives the *Mahāyāna* from the alliance of the original Buddhism with *Yoga*. As he puts it, "this *Yoga* parasite containing within itself the germs of *Tāntrism*" soon developed "monster growths" which "cankered the little life of purely Buddhist stock" in the *Mahāyāna*. Between *Mahāyāna* Buddhism and the revived *Purāṇic* or *Tāntric* Hinduism there was little difference in outlook. These restored and vastly reinforced ritualisms, however, provoked in due course further reactions. Predominant among these was

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preseyation Foundation, Chandigarh

the *Bhakti* school, which proclaimed the comparative futility of ritual and stressed the need for *bhāva* or emotion. Yet it is interesting to note that all the surviving sections of this school have developed their own forms and ritual, whether it be the orthodox *Vaiṣṇava* or the followers of the *Marāṭha* saints, or of *Kabīr* or *Caitanya*. Such is the persistence and vitality of the tendency towards form and ritual, the inherent *Tāntricism* of man, or at any rate of the Hindu.

This tendency cannot be properly understood unless it is recognized as a perfectly normal and legitimate phenomenon, which becomes pathological only when it runs into excess. The Indian *Tantras* do show occasional symptoms of such excess, but judged as a whole they are far from being "pathological excrescences" on the surface of Hinduism as they have been dubbed by prejudiced foreign observers and by their Indian *mānasaputras*, their intellectual progeny. For too long, this opinion has held the field and few have cared to investigate the truth or falsity of the charge. But there are some signs of a change, although not of a complete one. Thus, Keyserling says in his *Travel Diary*, "I am personally convinced that the teachings of the *Tantras* are correct on the whole, but that it is nevertheless in the order of things that they meet with less and less observance, for the development of humanity tends away from ritualism." With reference to this, however, Woodroffe observes, "I have my doubts as regards this last point. A strong ritualistic revival is in force today and there is always likely to be the reciprocal reaction of Puritanism and Ritualism."

Balanced Indian opinion through the ages has always given a high place to *Tantra*. The world *Āgama*, which stands indifferently for the Veda and the *Tantra*, has been adopted by common consent for indicating authoritative tradition, the third canon of right knowledge. Kulluka Bhatta, the celebrated commentator on Manu does not step outside the pale of orthodoxy when he asserts that *Śruti* or the revealed word is twofold, *Vaidika* and *Tāntrika*: *vaidikī tāntrikī caiva dvividhā śruti kīrtitā*. This is strictly in keeping with the teaching of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Bhāgavata* that religious practice or *Ācāra* is of three kinds: *Vaidika*, *Tāntrika*, and *Miśra* or composite. The generality of Hindu observances today could only be classified as *Miśra*, so inextricably are the *Vaidika* and *Tāntrika* elements mixed up in it. The Veda and *Tantra* do indeed constitute the warp and woof of Hindu thought and usage.

Even the most cursory examination of the commonest *saṃskāras* or ceremonials, those connected with birth, the investiture of the sacred thread, marriage and death will at once reveal this double framework. The well-known daily observance known as the *Sandhyāvandana* furnishes a good illustration, showing how intimately the two strains have been blended in it to form a homogeneous and artistic whole. The core of the *Sandhyāvandana* is the *Gāyatrī*, a *mantra* from the *Ṛgveda* addressed to the deity *Savitṛ*, the beneficent energy animating the Sun, praying for stimulation and enlivening of the worshipper's intelligence. Subserving it are a number of other *mantras* invoking the Waters, *Agni*, etc. Yet these are imbedded in a setting which is wholly *Tāntrika*, purporting

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

to be the worship of a feminine deity known as *Sandhyā* personifying the three times of worship, the morning twilight, noon and the evening twilight. Although the *Gāyatrī* is addressed to the male deity *Savitṛ*, the *mantra* itself is pictured for purposes of *dhyāna* as a goddess with five faces and ten arms, each face having a different colour and each hand bearing a weapon. The weapons are characteristic of the five great divinities in whom *Purāṇic* or *Tāntrik* worship settled down: *Gaṇeśa, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Devī* and *Sūrya*, the well-known *Pancāyatana*. The repetition of the *Gāyatrī* is preceded by mystic syllables known as *Vyāhṛtis* to which great importance is attached and which are similar to the *Bījākṣaras* of *Tāntrik* meditation. The whole is eked out with all the familiar components of *Tāntrik sādhanā, bhūśuddhi, bhūtaśuddhi, bhūtoccāṭana, nyāsa, mudra* and what not.

It would be interesting to try to separate these overlapping strands and examine their distinctive characteristics. It cannot however be lost sight of that the element of *Tantra* has infiltrated into the Veda itself. The *mantras* of the *Ṛgveda* indicate their ritual application at every step. In the *Yajurveda*, ritualistic usage predominates and this *Saṃhitā* is in the main a volume of sacrificial formulæ to be used in conjunction with selected *mantras* from the *Ṛgveda*. The text of the *Sāmaveda* consists of extracts from the *Ṛgveda*, adapted for being sung or chanted in different modes, and having special reference to their use in the *Soma* sacrifices. Above all, the *Atharva Veda* with its mystic invocations and its incantations for medicinal and magical purposes, has the most direct affinity with the *Tantras* proper in aim and content and even in form. *Tāntrik* tradition holds that apart from the extant text of the *Atharva Veda*, there is another known as the *Saubhāgya Kāṇḍa* whose methodology is identical with that of the *Tantras* and which forms the foundation of later *Tāntrik* doctrine and practice. The connection between the *Atharva Veda* and the *Tantra* has long been recognised, as may be seen, for example, from the definition of the practices known as *Abhicāra* as "the *karma* described in the *Tantras* and the *Atharva Veda*". Of the *Brāhmaṇa* treatises, it has already been mentioned that they constitute the *tantra* or technique of the Veda. The *Upaniṣads* are appendices to these *Brāhmaṇas*. That the bulk of them, the so-called minor or later ones deal with topics similar to those of the *Tantra* is a matter of common knowledge. Characteristically, the large majority of them are attached to the *Atharva Veda*. Even the earliest *Upaniṣads* have in them distinct *Tāntrik* tendencies which will be referred to later on.

A possible misapprehension has to be cleared up at this stage. It might possibly and plausibly be objected that what has here been called the *Tāntrik* element is really the *Purāṇic* element, and that this has to be distinguished from the *Tantras* proper. No doubt, the *Purāṇas* are a branch of Hindu religious literature distinct from the *Tantras*, but it is beyond doubt that the spirit of the two is very similar if not identical. The *Purāṇas* are comprised mainly of mythological accounts of the creation of the world, the stories of *avatāras*, of famous kings of the solar and lunar dynasties and such other legendary matter. No doubt, philosophy and

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

religious conduct come in for notice in the *Purāṇas*, but only incidentally. On the other hand, the *Tantras* are solely concerned with these, being essentially *Sādhanā Śāstras*. This must be the reason why the *Bhāgavata* as well as Kulluka Bhatta have preferred the term *Tāntrik* in their classification where at first sight the word *Paurāṇika* would seem to have been more appropriate.

It has been urged against the *Tantras* that as compared with the Vedas and even the *Purāṇas*, they are of recent origin and hence not authoritative. It must be admitted that their language as well as references to contemporary events and ideas bears out their modernity. But although the form may be recent, it would not be safe to assert that the content or at least the core of it is not derived from the remote past. This holds good of the *Purāṇas* also, the name itself suggesting immemorial antiquity. References, however brief and scrappy, in the Vedas to *Purāṇic* names and episodes establish beyond doubt that the subject matter of the *Purāṇas* was already extant. There are good grounds for holding that the *Purāṇic* mythology can lay claim to an age far greater than what Western orientalists are willing to concede and that this is the case with the *Tāntrik* doctrine and practices also. Thus it has been held, and not without grounds, that the cult of *Śiva* and *Śakti* with which the *Tantras* are prominently associated was already established and flourishing four millenniums before Christ in the civilization of the Indus valley. In historic times, Pliny mentions the worship of *Kanyā Kumārī* at Cape Comorin, a fact which suggests that it must have been established in the south of India long before the time of the *Periplus*.

In fact, there is much in the *Tantra* which points to a connection with the aboriginal inhabitants of India, as may be inferred from historic evidence as well from survivals imbedded in the habits and customs of primitive tribes still to be found in India.

The evolution of Hinduism has been mainly through syncretic methods and only occasionally through supersession, and the growth of the *Tantras* and *Purāṇas* has been on characteristically similar lines. They remind one of the great Indian temples whose sacred nucleus is most often some tiny shrine where some small idol or even stone formation was being worshipped from time immemorial. With the slow passage of time, the old shrine was built upon and around or even renovated, and enclosures and *Gopurams* came into being commensurate with the piety and wealth of generations of devotees. Even the name and attributes of the deity itself may have undergone a metamorphosis as in the classic instance of Tirupati. Yet these temples have continued to be the focus of the devotion of millions through the centuries and their sacredness has, if at all, gained in the process.

There is also another aspect of the matter which invites consideration. Where there is the capacity for evolution and progress, for practice and experiment, antiquity is by no means the test of merit or authenticity. Hindu opinion has always maintained that religion is a matter of *sādhanā* and experiment. That the number of the Vedas and *Purāṇas* was fixed long ago while the number of the *Tantras* was growing until recently, is in many respects a point in favour of the *Tantras*, for they profess to be practical interest and value, as in the case

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

of scientific research. This must be the basis of the claim put forward by the *Tantras* that they are the sole scriptures for the *Kaliyuga*. It is certainly true, that notwithstanding their many shortcomings, the *Tantras* have shown in the field of *sādhanā* or specific religious endeavour a courage, an enterprise and a spirit of adventure not to be matched elsewhere even in the superb range of Hinduism. It is their unique merit that they, as it were, turned the course of the stream of spiritual effort back on itself, and, in the words of Aurobindo Ghose, converted the very obstacles to spiritual realization into stepping stones.

The content and specific character of the *Tantras* may now be examined in somewhat greater detail. It is observed, at the very outset, that they are mainly concerned with the ritual worship of deities of *Purāṇic* origin although there is a vast increase in subsidiary nomenclature. The principal divinities are five in number, *Gaṇeśa*, *Viṣṇu*, *Sūrya*, *Śiva* and *Śakti*, already referred to as the *Pancāyatana*, a term which well brings out their integral connection with one other. They are not independent and unrelated entities, as foreign scholars and local sectarians often try to make out, but are five branches proceeding from the same trunk, five aspects of the same central unity. At present the cults of *Gaṇapati* and *Sūrya* are not numerically important and are almost merged in those of *Śiva*, *Śakti* and *Viṣṇu* respectively. *Gaṇeśa* is absorbed in *Śiva-Śakti* whose offspring indeed he is said to be. *Viṣṇu* and *Sūrya* are considered as interchangeable forms, as may be seen, for example, from the designation of the sun as *Sūrya-Nārāyaṇa*, and the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

declaration of Śrī Kṛṣna in the *Gītā* that he is *Viṣṇu* among the *Ādityas.* The cults of *Śiva* and *Śakti*, too, are bound up in the most intimate fashion, the relation between the two entities being described as *avinābhāva sambandha* or *apṛthak-siddhi.* Mythology beautifully pictures this in the image of *Ardhanārī-Īśvara* whose right half represents *Śiva* and the left *Śakti.* Thus only two main groups are left over, the *Vaiṣṇava* and the *Śaiva-Śakta.*

It cannot be sufficiently stressed that there is no unbridgeable gulf between the *Vaiṣṇava* and *Śaiva* schemes. Notwithstanding sectarian fanaticism, enlightened Hindu opinion has always maintained that there is complete identity between *Viṣṇu* and *Śiva.* Any number of passages could be cited in support of this position from the *Mahābhārata*, the *Purāṇas*, the *Tantras* and the *Upaniṣads.* Thus a well-known *Upaniṣad*, the *Skāndopaniṣad*, devotes itself to expounding the unity of *Viṣṇu* and *Śiva*, and the *Sammohana Tantra* calls him a fool who sees difference between the two. In a manner of speaking, the link between them is provided by the concept of *Śakti.* *Devī* is described in mythology in several episodes as the sister of *Kṛṣṇa* or *Viṣṇu*, and in others as the consort of *Śiva.* It is interesting to note that in the *Kenopaniṣad* there is the profound allegory in which *Umā*, the daughter of *Himavat*, who is no other than *Śiva's* spouse, is depicted as the *Śakti* of *Brahman* revealing herself to the gods. On the other hand, the Supreme Power or Essence is designated as *Mahāmāyā* or *Viṣṇumāyā* in the celebrated episode in the *Mārkandeya Purāṇa*, variously known as the *Candī* or *Durgā Saptaśati* or *Devī Māhātmya*, which is, as it

State Museum, LUCKNOW.

were, the Bible of the *Durgā* cult. It is one and the same essence, whether associated with *Śiva* or *Viṣṇu* or *Brahma*, the three members of the great Hindu Trinity, called severally *Mahākāḷī*, *Mahālakṣmī* or *Ādiśakti*. Considered in this broad and liberal aspect, *Śakti* is the least sectarian of concepts because *Iṣṭa-devatā*, the chosen deity, is itself *Śakti*. In this sense all the *Tantras* may well be described as *Śākta*.

However, leaving out the great mass of the Buddhist *Tantras*, the orthodox Hindu *Tantras* could be divided into two broad groups already mentioned, the *Vaiṣṇava* and the *Śaiva-Śākta*. Of these, the *Vaiṣṇava* is much smaller in range and compass, and is made up of the *Pāñcarātra* and *Vaikhānasa Āgamas*. The *Pāñcarātra* partakes more of the specific character of *Tantra*, while the *Vaikhānasa* is said to be composite of Vedic and *Purāṇic* elements. An idea of the contents of the former may be got from Dr. O. Schrader's excellent *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra*.

The extant literature bearing on the *Śiva-Śakti* group is very voluminous. According to the emphasis, it has two subdivisions, the *Śaiva* proper and the *Śākta*, although these two have very much in common with each other. The *Śaiva Āgama* has two main branches, the Northern and the Southern, the former associated with the *Trika* school of Kashmir the latter having affinities with the *Śaiva Siddhānta* of South India. The large bulk of the remaining *Tantras* belong to the *Śākta* school with its endless ramifications. Overlapping classifications abound here. One such is based on form. Most *Tantras* take the form of diologues between *Śiva* and *Devī*. Those in which *Śiva* is the principal speaker have been called *Āgamas*, while those in which *Devī* speaks are called *Nigamas*. There is again a well-known division into *Dakṣiṇa* and *Vāma*, the right and left hand paths based on the character of the observances. The former advocates disciplines which are on the whole in conformity with the Vedic prescriptions regarding conduct; in the latter, on the other hand, scope is allowed for practices which are conventionally considered objectionable, *e.g.*, the use of meat and liquor and of the sex act in ritual. On this account, the *Vāmācāra* school has come in for a great deal of notoriety and condemnation. Even in the *Vāmācāra* there are grades and levels, the highest according to their own tradition being the *Kaula sādhanā* in which complete freedom is claimed from all traditional restraints. There are sets of *Tantras* belonging to both the schools, sometimes roughly, but not quite correctly, described as *Vaidika* and *Avaidika*.

There is also something like a territorial division among the *Śākta* traditions or *sampradāyas*. Thus there are four principal *sampradāyas*: *Kāśmīra*, *Gauda*, *Vilāsa* and *Kerala*. Among these it is said that the *Gauda* tradition, which was dominant in Bengal, has the greatest affinities with *Vāmācāra*, and the *Kerala* with *Dakṣiṇa* or *Vedācāra*. This latter is often designated *Samayācāra*, and a classification of *Tantras* into *Kaula*, *Samaya* and *Miśra* (or mixed) is popular, their number being 64, 5 and 8 respectively. The *Sammōhana Tantra* mentions 64 *Tantras*, 327 *Upatantras* and also other *Śākta* scriptures going under the name of *Yāmalas*, *Dāmaras* and *Saṃhitas*. There is a further division based on origin from each of

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

the six faces of *Śiva*, four facing the cardinal points of the compass, one upwards and another downwards. These have been called the six *āmnāyas*: *Ṣaḍāmnāya.* Thus it is said in the *Devī Āgama* that *Śiva's* Eastern (front) face is of pearl-like lustre with three eyes and crowned by the crescent moon. By this face he is said to have revealed the deities *Bhuvaneśvari*, *Tripurā*, *Lalitā*, *Padmā*, *Śūlinī*, *Sarasvatī*, *Tvaritā*, *Nityā*, *Vajraprastāriṇī*, *Annapūrṇa*, *Mahālakṣmī*, *Lakṣmī* and *Vāgvādinī*, with all their rites and *mantras*. Similar lists are given for the other faces or *Āmnāyas* ending with the sixth or lowest face, *Īśānāmnāya*, through which are said to have been revealed *Devatāsthāna*, *Āsana*, *Yantra*, *Mālā*, *Naivedya*, *Balidāna*, *Sādhanā*, *Purascaraṇa* and *Mantrasiddhi*.

It is through the monumental labours of Sir John Woodroffe that a substantial plot out of this vast demesne has been thrown open to the public. In his own name as well as under the pen-name of Arthur Avalon he has given to the world a representative series of *Tāntrik* Texts with scholarly introductions and in some cases (*e. g.*, the *Mahānirvāṇa Tantra*) with full translations, as well as expository writings which display great courage as well as insight. Many of these latter are well-known and deservedly: *Is India Civilized? Śakti and Śākta*, *Serpent Power*, *The Garland of Letters* and the series known as *The World as Power*, to mention only a few. He has laid India under a deep debt of gratitude by his fearless championing of one of the most misunderstood aspects of her religion and culture. One who is interested in the subject could not have a better introduction to the subject than through the writings of

Woodroffe. Much of the factual matter presented in this essay is derived from this source. For many, his writings have proved the harbingers of a revival of faith in the efficacy of *Sādhanā* or experimental religion. Practically for the first time in English he attempted to take ritualism seriously and to provide its rationale, which although by no means the last word on the subject, is packed with fruitful suggestions. No one who enters the field can advance even a step without paying his tribute of admiration to this pioneer who made himself something like an intellectual outcaste among his own people by venturing into a region which for long has been deemed intellectually "untouchable". To him, almost entirely, is due the change in attitude towards the appreciation of *Tāntrik* religion to which reference has been made above.

The reasons for this remarkable change have been given variously. Thus the French savant M. Masson-Oursel attributes it to the fact that "as one increasingly explored the *Tāntrik* literature, hitherto almost unknown, the discovery is not of more and more dissimilarities, but of a closer and closer connection between these scriptures and other religions." This, no doubt, partly accounts for the change in attitude. There is, indeed, an innate conservatism in man which responds favourably only to the accustomed and familiar but at once closes up and presents a defensive and hostile front towards whatever is novel or out of the way, reminding one of the ancient Greeks who dubbed everything beyond their own limited Hellenic horizon as barbarian. Scholars seem to be no exception to this rule, especially when appraising an alien culture. The change itself is described by the famous Orientalist, Winternitz, as follows: "Up till the present, we have been accustomed to see nothing else in *Śāktism* aud the *Tantras*, the sacred books of this sect, other than wild superstition, occult humbug, idiocy, empty magic and a cult with a most objectionable morality," but that subsequent to the publication of the *Tāntrik* Texts by Avalon, it is being realised that "these things are indeed to be found in this religion and in its sacred texts, but that by these their contents are nevertheless in no wise exhausted. On the contrary, we rather find that behind the nonsense there lies hidden, after all, much deep sense and that immorality is not the end and aim of the cult of the Mother. We find that the mysticism of the *Tantras* has been built upon the basis of that mystic doctrine of the unity of the soul and of all with the *Brahman* which is proclaimed in the *Upaniṣads* and which belongs to the most profound speculations which the Indian spirit has imagined."

This strange commentary offers much food for thought. One cannot help wondering how nonsense and such deep sense could go hand in hand, and whether, after all, the nonsense might not have been really something else. This judgment requires more careful examination, which may be amply worth while. Its commencement savours more of prejudice and deep-seated dislike than of reason, and almost borders on invective. Evidently, the critic's sense of respectability has been outraged and is having its revenge: the intellectual respectability of orthodox science—for magic is the *bete noir* of science and of conventional morality. And it has to be conceded, at the very start, that the outlook of the *Tantras* is distinctly magical, and that in them there has also been a deliberate taking of liberties with conventional morality. "The very head and front of their offending hath this extent, no more!" But a magical outlook need not necessarily be superstitious, although in these days it requires considerable courage to say so. It was a very wise saying of Bacon that there may be a supersition in avoiding superstition. More than at any time in the recent past is it being realised today that there is more in heaven and earth than is dreamt of in the current philosophy, and that this *more* is not to be spirited away by a denial however vehement.

Investigations, whether in the psychological laboratory or the seance room, or the outside world of everyday experience, have established beyond doubt that there is a comparatively intangible but none-the-less real side of human experience not accountable to the mechanical regularities of science. Very little room is left here for superstitious credulity or ignorance. For example, the remarkable experiments of Dr. J. B. Rhine of Duke University have shown that what he has called extra-sensory perception is a hard fact and that people do have access to faculties like telepathy and clairvoyance under favourable circumstances and in a far larger measure than would ordinarily be thought possible. That prevision of future happenings is feasible has been shown by J. W. Dunne in his very interesting book, *An Experiment with Time*, where he tries to eke out his facts by a novel scientific theory. The mere admission of the possibility of such phenomena has very far-reaching consequences for science as well as philosophy. The conviction regarding the reality of such experiences is also the prelude to the search for methods by which such faculties may be developed. What a colossal waste of human opportunity it would be if mankind were to start the search afresh ignoring the vast material that is at hand! Yet, in the *Tantras* and the treatises on *Yoga* there is an amount of stuff gathered with infinite patience through centuries which would amply repay attention, if only the deep sincerity of the authors of these works were realised and the records taken seriously. Occultism need not all be humbug nor magic empty.

The evidence of the *Tantras* and of innumerable *sādhakas* goes to show that the occultism was not humbug nor the magic empty. The crucial test of any form of *sādhanā* is efficacy, whether it leads to the desired result or not. The balance of testimony is that *sādhanā* did lead to *siddhi*, if the necessary conditions, mainly psychological, were satisfied. The question arises how if magic was successful in the past, the success is not demonstrable now. It is not too much to say that it does not work now because the psychic atmosphere is, as it were, unsuitable, and hence the art is practically lost. But as the *Yoga Sūtra* points out, *siddhis* on a minor scale can be had by even ordinary people with very little *sādhanā*, like the perception of scents and the hearing of sounds without any objective basis, and that although these are of no use by themselves, they serve a useful purpose in carrying conviction to the *sādhaka* regarding the potentialities of further *sādhanā*. It may be said without hesitation that the great attraction of the *Tantras* to the modern mind lies in the prospects raised by the tangible experience of minor *siddhis*. People find here something tangible, "thick", to use William James's word, something scientific and demonstrable in the broadest sense, which is a welcome change from the "thin" airy nothings of argumentative and speculative philosophy or the blind emotionalism of popular types of religion.

But the *Tantras* are not works which "he who runs may read". They do not "carry their heart on their sleeve for daws to peck at". They can be appreciated, if at all, as footnotes to *sādhanā*. They are precisely what they claim to be, descriptions of processes and a record of results, and are not merely the outcome of imaginative speculation. This applies to the *dhyānas* of *Yoga*, to *sādhanā* with the *mantras* and *yantras* of the *Tantra*, as well as to the meditations known as the *Upaniṣadic vidyās*. Failure to understand this is at the bottom of that impatience and lack of comprehension which provoke double-edged epithets like "idiocy". A well-known historian of science has said complacently that the great division of mankind is into those who are willing to use the experimental method, and those who are not. Yet with what facility is not a scholar or scientist prepared to condemn off-hand results claiming to be based on experiment, while he himself is neither willing to experiment nor even to concede the validity of the experimental method. The rejection is pontifical, contemptuous and final. The loss, unfortunately, is not so much his as that of humanity.

The implications of the magical outlook for science and philosophy are well worth examination. The oldest religions were an intimate compound of so-called "pure" religion or science and magic, the last being, as it were, the ground-work in which the other two manifested themselves. Such was the case with the religions of ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, India and China, not to speak of the Western hemisphere. In recent times, a host of investigators, beginning with Tylor, have tried to tackle the problem of the origins of religion. Huge works like Sir James Frazer's *Golden Bough* bear testimony to the vast quantity of material that has been collected. Anthropologists as well as students of mythology and folklore, of philology and ethnology have devoted their attention to the subject. The latest to enter the field are the psychologists, especially of the psycho-analytical school, and Freud has as many interesting things to say as any one else. But all of them appear to have approached the subject through their own prepossessions, with postulates drawn from mechanistic biology and physical science, and after herculean labours have proclaimed results comparable in human significance to the proverbial mouse which the mountain brought forth. And this mouse they had taken with them at the very start!

The hypothesis put forward by them and commonly accepted makes out magic as the villain of the piece, a spurious interloper whose elimination made it possible for true science and true religion to emerge. It is asserted that there can be no conflict between these two as they function in entirely distinct spheres, science in the physical world and religion in that of values where science can not intrude. Magic is pictured as the common enemy of both. But there are not wanting authorities

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

like Freud who attempt to make out that religion itself has no better foundation than magic, and that it is nothing more than a "compensatory fantasy", an attempt to "escape from reality", as may be seen from his much-discussed book, *The Future of an Illusion.* He would leave nothing to mankind but mechanistic science to fall back upon. And he has numerous adherents in spirit.

To discuss all the issues involved here would be impossible within the compass of a short paper. The principal issue may however be categorically stated, Religion implies a magical view of the universe. At its core it has been concerned with the perception and appreciation of something akin to personality at the back of the universe, though not necessarily in the crude anthropomorphical sense. The most universal feature of all religions is the conviction that the constitution of the universe permits specific response to prayer. It is based on a monistic view of experience, positing its continuity and the possibility of psychophysical interaction. There is no sharp and unbridgeable gulf between matter and spirit or between subject and object. Ritual is no more than symbolic activity which exploits this conviction and helps to bring the individual into harmonious relation with his environment in the broadest sense. It results in direct experience, which is its sole aim as well as justification. But science by its very nature is hostile to such a view, being founded on assumptions unconnected with personality or purpose. In the very nature of things a conflict is inevitable between the religious and scientific attitudes, as they are alternative and antithetical modes of approach to experience. The problem is not solved but merely evaded by saying that science is not opposed to religion but only to the magical view of the universe which has gone along with it, or that science and religion work in wholly different spheres which do not intersect. To retain the husk of religion after discarding its most vital assumption is like keeping the bath tub after throwing out the baby.

The perspective of the *Tantras* is frankly magical. They have courageously experimented and have sought to preserve the integrity of experience, even where it involved going counter to accepted religious and moral traditions where these had become petrified and lost significance. Their tendencies have often been revolutionary and this accounts for the deep hostilities they have aroused. They have been an adventure of the religious spirit. The incidents of the particular adventure are nothing, but the spirit of adventure is everything. The *Tāntrik* adventure was in the field of the individual psyche, and its upshot was to show that this field was not a tiny dark patch but a veritable mirror held up to the universe, nothing less than a microcosmos. The distinction of the *Tantras* is that their spirit is not "other-worldly". The *Tāntrik* does not start with far-fetched assumptions. For him, the tangible world of actual experience, this very world: *Jagat*, is the Mother: *Ambā*. It is *Devī* and not the Devil. Between this world and the other there is no inevitable conflict. The limited experience is never separated from the supreme and ineffable experience. The energy, *Śakti*, which is manifest in and as the universe, is in indissoluble union with the Supreme Person, *Śiva*. *Śiva* and *Śakti* do not operate

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

in incommensurable words like the Energy of science and the God of religion, nor do they oppose each other in a common sphere. The ecstasy of their union was the goal of the *Tāntrik sādhaka*. When once this is experienced, all the paraphernalia of ritual becomes superfluous. If this is not realisable, what then is the use of all the ritualistic impedimenta? That is the message and significance of the *Tantras* for the modern world.

KASHMIR ŚAIVISM

KASHMIR is very much in the news at present. But as against the sordid politics of the day, little is known of the glorious intellectual and philosophical past of the country of *Kaśyapa*, the mythological progenitor of the *Devas* and the *Asuras*. At one time, it must have been a veritable home of learning, in the sense not merely of erudition and scholarship, but of that true wisdom which constitutes the end and aim of all existence. Otherwise, it would be difficult to account for the very familiar *śloka* recited daily in almost every Hindu household, which describes *Śāradā* (*Sarasvatī*—the goddess of learning) as having her home in Kashmir: *Namaste Śārade Devi Kāśmīrapuravāsini.* At the time it was composed and for centuries afterwards there was evidently no divorce between learning and wealth, as the name of the capital, *Śrīnagara* indicates, *Śrī* meaning wealth—material as well as spiritual. The connection is well brought out in the term *Śrī Vidyā* so familiar to *Tāntrik* and other *Sādhakas*.

The original faith of the country was a kind of *Śaivism*, the prominent feature of which was the worship of *Śiva-Śakti* in the androgynous form of *Ardhanārī-Naṭeśvara.* Some investigators hold that this was the aboriginal faith of the whole of India prior to the advent of the Āryan tribes with their Vedas. Considerable support is lent to this view by the fact that the archæological excavations in Mohenjo-Daro seem to point unmistakably to the prevalence in that millenniums-old civilization of a full-fledged cult of *Śiva* with the characteristic accompaniments of the *Lingam* and the Bull. This religion which may have pervaded India centuries before the advent of foreigners was mainly based on traditions of antiquity signified by the words *Āgama* and *Purāṇa*. These have apparently been recast from time to time to suit the taste of later ages and the obvious modernity of the language of composition of many of these has misled scholars into believing that the stuff itself must be of recent origin, which, however, is often far from being the case. However that may be, the ancient traditions of the *Āgama* and *Purāṇa* compendiously and more familiarly termed *Tāntrik* have formed a strand in the web of Hinduism no less important than the Vedic. Perhaps present-day Hinduism is really more *Tāntrik* in texture than *Vaidik*. Throughout the ages, there has been a certain collaboration, as well as occasional antagonism between these two elements which has led to a remarkable interfusion. More of this later. But it would be of interest here to note that the Buddhist faith, which in many respects was a protest against the Brahmanical Vedic ritual, was unacceptable to India in its original form, but that after it had been worked upon for centuries by the indigenous *Tāntrik* leaven, it took the form of the *Mahāyāna*. Between the *Mahāyāna Tantras* and the orthodox Hindu *Tantras* there is a fundamental agreement both in outlook and in detail. It was in the *Tantras* that Hinduism and Buddhism found a common ground where they got reconciled to each other.

The spiritual history of Kashmir bears testimony to the truth of this hypothesis. Much of it can be read between the lines of Kalhaṇa's famous chronicle of the Kings of

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

Kashmir, known as the *Rājatarangiṇī*. In India, which with all the wealth and varied range of its literature has shown a marked deficiency on the historical side, this unique work stands out as a land-mark. Although much of the matter is legendary, the historical frame-work is not without value. *Kalhaṇa* was an avowed *Śaiva* but his partiality for the Buddhist faith is only too obvious. What strikes a modern reader is the catholicity of taste and the broad-minded tolerance of those ages, which present a refreshing contrast to the fanaticisms and bigotries of the present day: political and religious. We read with pleasure in *Kalhaṇa* that those princes and others who endowed Buddhist *Stūpas* and *Vihāras* endowed with equal zeal shrines of *Śiva* as well as of *Viṣṇu*.

Buddhism was introduced into Kashmir in the reign of Aśoka (273-232 B.C.). But, so wise was the way in which Buddhism was spread, so non-interfering was the religious policy and so judicious was the distribution of royal patronage that there was no marked hostility at first to the advent of the new faith. Only later on, alliance with the political power and the introduction of what might be described as exclusive and totalitarian conditions, gave rise to antagonisms, especially when Kaniśka (125-160 A.C.) made a gift of Kashmir to the Buddhist Church. It was at that time that the celebrated monk and scholar—Nāgārjuna—made use of organised propaganda to convert the country. A struggle seems to have ensued in which, however, the final victory did not rest with Buddhism. There was a revival of the local religious traditions and a systematisation of floating beliefs. With this renascence is prominently associated the name of a pious

Brāhman ascetic, *Candradeva*. This is symbolically depicted in the *Nīlamata Purāṇa* which is a canonical work of the ancient religion of Kashmir, wherein is related the deliverance of Kashmir from a plague of *Piśācas* through the rites revealed by *Nīla Nāga*. Incidentally, it may be remarked that the time seems to be ripe again for a second similar deliverance.

Little is known of the course of the religious life of the land during the next six centuries. Apparently the Buddha was assimilated in the local pantheon and admitted to worship as one of the gods. Thus, in the words of Dr. K. C. Pandey, to whose work on *Abhinavagupta* I am indebted for much of the material contained in this essay, there developed a religion which was neither purely Buddhist nor purely *Śaivite*, but was harmonious mixture of the meditative and philosophical aspect of the one and the ritualistic aspect of the other. It had its branches and schools of interpretation—dualistic as well as monistic—each with its own set of authoritative *Tantras* and traditions of oral interpretation. But it was something more than a purely local development. The dualistic school made its way to the South where it found a congenial habitat and flourished in the form of the Tamil *Śaiva Siddhānta* which shares with the Northern monistic school much of its philosophical terminology and many of its leading concepts. It is, however, with the fortunes of the latter school of thought that we are concerned here.

The tradition or *Āgama* of this branch is linked up with a set of *Tantras* of which the *Siddhayogīśvarī*, the *Mālinī*, and *Svacchanda* are the principal ones. Support is

State Museum,
LUCKNOW.

also derived from other ancient works like the *Rudrayāmala*. These works all have a mythological background and deal primarily with practice or *Sādhanā*, with philosophy and doctrine thrown in here and there. Systematic interpretation had to wait for some time more. These ancient bases of the faith and particularly the *Mālinīvijaya Tantra* which occupies a position of pre-eminent authority are referred to as the *Śrī Pūrva Śāstra*, comparable to the Old Testament, in the works pertaining to the newer presentation of the doctrine. The origins of the revival of the teaching, the New Testament, are also enveloped in legend. We are told that the Lord *Śiva* while roaming over Mount *Kailāsa* in the form of *Śrīkaṇṭha* was touched with pity for suffering humanity which was then immersed in spiritual darkness owing to the lack of correct understanding of the *Śaivāgamas*. He accordingly instructed the sage *Dūrvāsas* to revive the teaching, which he straightaway proceeded to do. The monistic line of teaching was confided by him to his mind-born son *Tryambaka* who propagated it.

The first historic name connected with the teaching is that of Vasugupta who probably lived in the first half of the ninth century A.C. It is said that the *Śiva Sūtras* were revealed to him through a dream. These *Sūtras* form the bedrock, as it were, of the system. There are several commentaries on the *Sūtras*, of which the most valuable are those by Kṣemarāja and Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara. Another important work is the *Spanda Kārikā*, an exposition and amplification in verse of the main teaching of the *Śivasūtras*. This is also attributed to Vasugupta, and is sometimes referred to as the *Spanda Sūtra*. It is commented on in the *Spanda Sarvasva* by Bhaṭṭa Kallaṭa, a disciple of Vasugupta. This great scholar was a contemporary of Avantivarman, King of Kashmir, who reigned between 855 and 883 A.C., and is referred to in the *Rājatarangiṇī* as a great *Siddha*.

In the next generation Somānanda, claiming to be nineteenth in direct descent from Tryambaka himself, wrote the *Śivadṛṣṭi*, the first attempt to present the doctrine in a reasoned philosophic form as contrasted with the dogmatic presentation in the *Śivasūtras* and the *Spanda Kārikā*. Somānanda, too, is said to have received inspiration in a dream. The *Śivadṛṣṭi* comprises 700 verses distributed over seven chapters. Somānanda's son and disciple Utpaladeva carried on the scholarly tradition. He wrote the famous *Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Kārikā* and a *vṛtti* or commentary thereon. It is from this that the Kashmir school of *Śaivism* has come to be popularly known as the *Pratyabhijñā* system, a name older than the *Sarvadarśana Saṁgraha* of Mādhavācārya. Utpaladeva also wrote a work in three parts known as the *Siddhitrayī*, and a *vṛtti* or commentary on his father's work, *Śivadṛṣṭi*.

Utpaladeva's son and disciple was Lakshmaṇagupta. He was a great scholar and *Tāntrika* and the author of an authoritative work on *Mantra Śāstra* called *Śāradā Tilaka*. No work of his directly dealing with the *Śaiva* system has come down to us, but he was undoubtedly the teacher of the celebrated *Abhinavagupta* whose position and status in the Kashmir *Śaiva* system is comparable to that of the great Śankarācārya in the *Advaita Vedānta*. Some detailed notice of this great scholar will, therefore, be of interest. His versatility and genius have

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

to be better known and appreciated in this land of which he is one of the major glories. It is a tell-tale commentary on our educational system that few "educated" men seem even to have heard his name. He was descended from Atrigupta, a great *Śaiva* scholar of the eighth century A.C., who lived in Antarvedi, probably the region between the *Gangā* and the *Yamunā* rivers. Lalitāditya, King of Kashmir, and a munificent patron of learning (700-736 A.C.) heard of his fame and invited him to settle down in Kashmir, which he did. Abhinavagupta was born in this family which produced generation after generation of reputed scholars and *Sādhakas*. He was born sometime between 950 and 960 A.C. His love for learning was insatiable and he studied systematically under the best teachers of his day and attained all-round proficiency in the *Sāstras*: orthodox as well as heterodox.

We find that he learnt grammar from his own father Narasimhagupta, the *Dvaitādvaita Tantras* from Vāmanātha, dualistic *Śaivism* from Bhūtirājatanaya, *Brahma Vidyā* from Bhūtirāja, the *Krama* and *Trika Darśanas* from Lakshmanagupta, *Dhvani* from Indurāja, and dramaturgy from Bhaṭṭa Tota. He studied at the feet of other great teachers also: Śrīcandra, Bhaktivilāsa, Yogānanda, Candravara, Abhinanda, Śivabhakti, Vicitranātha, Dharma, Śiva, Vāmana, Udbhaṭa, Bhūtīśa and Bhāskara. But the highest praise and regard is reserved by him for his *Guru* Śambhunātha who initiated him into the *Kaula Prakriyā* (system) through which he attained self-realisation and final peace. He was regarded as an incarnation of *Śiva* or *Bhairava* himself. He remained unmarried and devoted his whole life to the writing and teaching of the *Śāstras*. During his lifetime he was credited with the possession of miraculous powers and his end was in keeping with the tenor of his life. It is said that one evening after his work was finished, he walked with 1,200 disciples into the Bhairava Cave, to be seen even now at a spot midway between Śrīnagar and Gulmarg, and was never seen again!

Over fifty works, including *Stotras*, are attributed to him. One of the most important of these is the *Tantrāloka* dealing exhaustively with the contents of the sixty-four monistic *āgamas*, on the ritualistic as well as the philosophical side. It is based on the authority of the *Mālinīvijaya Tantra*. There is a valuable commentary on the *Tantrāloka* by Jayaratha. Abhinavagupta himself made two summaries of his big work, one called *Tantrasāra* and a still briefer one called *Tantravaṭa Dhānika*.Abhinava also wrote a commentary—*Mālinīvijaya Vārtika*—on the first verse of *Mālinīvijaya Tantra*. He wrote two commentaries, a big one (*Bṛhatī Vimarśinī*) and a smaller one (*Vivṛti Vimarśinī*) on Utpala's *Īśvara Pratyabhijñā*. He is credited with having written a commentary *Śivadṛṣṭi-ālocana* on Somānanda's original, but it is not available. He wrote two commentaries, a bigger one called *Vivaraṇa* and a smaller one called *Laghuvṛtti* on the *Parātrimśikā*, an important *Tāntrik* work purporting to give the gist of the *Rudrayāmala*. Then comes a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* entitled *Bhagavad-gītārtha Saṁgraha*. He is credited with having written a commentary on the *Yoga Vāsiṣṭa* but it is not available. Apart from *Tantra* he has written the monumental work *Abhinava Bhāratī* on

Bharata's *Nātya Śāstra*, and the *Dhvanyālokalocana*, a commentary on the *Dhvanyālōka* of Ānandavardhana, which are both authorities in their own sphere of poetics up till today.

Abhinava was followed by a succession of brilliant expositors like Kṣemarāja, but the stream thinned rapidly and at present there are perhaps in Kashmir not even three or four competent pandits who can understand and expound the *Śaiva* system. So it has been very little studied in recent times and its valuable teachings are shrouded in a veil of obscurity. A corner of the veil was lifted when the Kashmir Government, not very many years ago, undertook the publication of the ancient texts pertaining to this system. Several have already been brought out and constitute an invaluable contribution to the world's stock of philosophical material. A good but somewhat incomplete account of the system in English is given in J. C. Chatterji's *Kashmir Śaivism* in the same series. I have already referred to Dr. K. C. Pandey's excellent monograph on the life and work of Abhinavagupta which is a mine of information for all those interested in the subject. There are also scrappy references to the system in the histories of Indian philosophy. With this historical and textual background, we may now proceed to examine the basic ideas of the school.

We may first deal with some general characteristics. The system, although often referred to as the *Pratyabhijñā* or *Spanda*—names which we have had occasion to mention—is designated by its own followers as the *Trika*. The word means triune or threefold and obviously points to the various triads of categories described in the system. For example, we have the threefold classification of *Pati* or the Supreme Lord, *Paśu* or the bound *Jīva*, and *Pāśa* or the bond which forms a sort of link between them or rather a nexus the existence of which perpetuates the separateness of the two but whose disappearance leads to the recognition of their essential identity. It is this recognition which is technically termed *Pratyabhijñā*. This recognition is not of a passive and static reality, like the Vedāntic Absolute (*Taṭastha Brahman*). It is an active and dynamic perception ever renewing itself and is described as *Camatkāra*. Perception (*Dṛk*) in this system is indissolubly bound up with activity (*Kriyā*). Far from being in perpetual opposition, and continually excluding and contradicting each other, as in other systems, they form a couple (*Yāmala* or *Mithuna*) whose mutual interaction (*Saṁghaṭṭa*) is the basis of all experience, up to the very highest. This dynamism is also known as *Spanda*, the literal meaning of which is vibration or energy, a notion which fits in very well with modern scientific concepts.

When the *Jñāna* or *Prakāśa* or perception side of it is emphasised, it is called *Śiva* when the *Vimarśa* or activity or reflection side of it is dominant it is called *Śakti*. Together they form a single entity named differently according to function. Other names for this highest reality are *Anuttara*, a term redolent with Buddhistic associations and literally signifying that which has no beyond, and also *Caitanya* and *Citi*. The chief characteristic of *Śakti* is *Svātantrya* or freedom of activity. This aspect is so crucial for this system that it has frequently been designated *Svātantryavāda*, in contradistinction to the *Vijñānavāda* of the Buddhist idealists, the *Māyāvāda* or *Vivartavāda* of the *Advaita Vedāntins* and the *Pariṇāmavāda* of the realists. *Svātantryavāda* claims to resolve in itself the contradiction of realism and idealism and likes to describe itself as realistic idealism, a phrase which connotes the fusion in this system of various apparently opposed trends of speculation.

Svātantrya or *Śakti* is itself three-fold in experience, composed as it is of Will (*Icchā*), Knowledge (*Jñāna*) and Activity (*Kriyā*) *śaktis*, another of those fundamental triads which go to justify the designation of *Trika*. This happy blending of several trends of thought is a feature regarding which Abhinava himself has said that if fundamental dualism is dropped out of *Āgamik* realism, if *Māyā* which is deemed a mere principle of illusion by the *Advaita Vedāntins* should be interpreted as *Śakti*, and if the two *Vijñānas* of the Buddhas were to be explained in terms of *Ātman* and *Iśvara*, we would have the essence of the *Trika* teaching.

Like all Indian *Darśanas* the *Trika* is a scheme of categories or *Tattvas*. The term *Tattva* is difficult to translate, for it is not identical with "category" which has an entirely objective significance and corresponds in our terminology to *Grāhya*. But *Tattva* in its higher reaches includes the conception of subject also or *Grāhaka*. It has been well said in the *Āgama* that ordinary knowledge is indissolubly bound up with the concepts of *Grāhya* and *Grāhaka*, object and subject as distinct, but the perception of the *Yogis* is centred in the common ground or *Sambandha* between these two. It should not, however, be imagined that this is some extraordinary region of experience available, if at all, only to a few adepts.

But that is not the *Trika* conception, according to which these levels are accessible at all times and even in the waking condition, to all human beings who are capable of reflection or discrimination. They are, however, not realised as they are not capable of being distinguished, and are thus ignored and lost sight of. The aim of spiritual discipline (*Sādhanā*) according to the *Trika* is to achieve this recognition or *Pratyabhijñā*. Such a thing cannot be done from outside—even the *Guru* can only point the direction, as it were with his finger—*Dīkṣā*. But the seeker alone can identify the essence within himself. Here no external help whatever is possible. The most familiar illustration given in the books is that of a pupil asking the teacher to show him his own (the pupil's) eyes. At best the teacher can hand a mirror to the pupil and ask him to look into it himself. Incidentally it may be mentioned here that this example of the mirror and the reflected image, the *Darpaṇa-pratibimba Nyāya*, plays as great a role in this system as the illustration of the rope imagined to be a snake—the *Rajjusarpa Nyāya*—plays in the *Māyāvāda Vedānta*.

Like the orthodox *Advaita Vedānta*, the *Trika* adopts the ground-work of the twenty-four *Sāṁkhya* categories or *Tattvas* of which the essence is the dichotomy of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. It is the latter which evolves into the descending series of objective *Tattvas*: first *Buddhi*, *Ahaṁkāra* and *Manas*, the three jointly constituting the inner organ or *Antaḥkaraṇa* then the ten external organs, five relating to perception or sense—*Jñānendriyas*, and five relating to activity—*Karmendriyas*, the five *Mahābhūtas* or gross cosmic elements and the five *Tanmātras* or subtle elements—

Śabda, *Sparśa*, *Rūpa*, *Rasa* and *Gandha*, which form the link between the *Bhūtas* and the *Indriyas*. All these are *Jaḍa* or inert objective categories which merge in the principal one, *Pradhāna* or *Prakṛti*, which is the seed of objective manifestation, sharply contrasted with which stands *Puruṣa* who is pure intelligence and eternally distinct from *Prakṛti*. The highest realisation according to the *Sāṁkhya* is to perceive the distinction between *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*. This constitutes release or freedom and is termed *Kaivalya* or isolation of the *Puruṣa*. It has to be stressed that the stage of *Puruṣa* is not a mere speculative rest-house in the path of the discursive intellect but a level of actual attainment through the *Sāṁkhyan* discrimination or the *Yoga* discipline. This fundamental dualism is, however, far from satisfying to many who demand some reasonable solution of two main problems left over: the multiplicity of *Puruṣas* who may be deemed atoms of sentience, or *Cidaṇus* as the *Trika* calls them, and why and how inert *Prakṛti* functions in the interest of the *Puruṣa*.

The *Vedānta* and the *Trika* start where the *Sāṁkhya* leaves off. Most of the *Vedāntic* polemics, *e.g.*, *Śankara's* commentary on the *Brahma Sūtras*, are concerned with trying to prove that there is no such entity as *Pradhāna*, and that the essential reality is One and Intelligent. The perception of the phenomenal world is attributed to a principle of illusion known as *Māyā*, which is neither real nor unreal and about which one cannot speak consistently (*Anirvacanīya*). The process is known as superimposition or *Adhyasa*. Between *Vyavahāra* and *Paramārtha*, there is no gradation but a single leap of experience. Above *Puruṣa* there is only *Brahman* with *Māyā* in between.

If somehow the veil of *Māyā* is lifted, the world of phenomena disappears and the world of essence shines in all its glory. This is the only reality—*Paramārtha*, as compared with which the entire phenomenal world—*Vyavahāra*—is unreal. We have, therefore, the famous *Vedāntic* formula: *Brahmaiva satyam, jaganmithyā*. The apparent order and evolution in ordinary experience is not substantial (*Pariṇāma*) but illusory (*Vivarta*). In the process of realization, only *Jñāna* or knowledge counts, *Karma* being not merely futile but even the principal obstacle in the way. Such is the *Vedāntic* doctrine as simplified—perhaps over-simplified, as some might object.

The *Trika* approach is somewhat different. For the *Trika*, the distinction between reality and unreality is only relative. In their own way, the image reflected in the mirror or the snake imagined in the rope has each its grade of reality and performs its respective function; they are all designated as *Ābhāsas*, a term which has given the name *Ābhāsavāda* as an alternative to this system, which rejects the *Vivartavāda* contention of the Neo-Vedānta that the world is originally a false appearance due to error. The *Trika* holds that *Ābhāsa* is real in the same sense in which an image which has no existence apart from the medium of its manifestation is real. Its existence is bound up with the existence of the medium. The world is thus real and as the expression of the *Svātantrya*—free-will—of the Supreme Lord is spiritual in essence like the Lord Himself.

The main distinction now becomes clear when we see that the *Vivartavāda* while admitting pure *Caitanya* as the highest category denies its *Svātantrya*. In the *Trika*,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

experience at all levels is *Ābhāsa* or manifestation, but the manifestation is not a creation out of nothing, but the focusing of attention, as it were, on an already existent thing. The ultimate reality already contains within it all the *Ābhāsas*: All that *is*. In other words, all that can be said to exist in any way and with regard to which the use of any kind of language is possible, be it the subject, the object or the means of knowledge or the knowledge itself, is *Ābhāsa*. But *Ābhāsa* is transitory. The *Trika* accepts the stand-point of momentariness—*Kṣaṇikavāda*—of the Bauddhas, and does not make permanence—*Nityatva*—a criterion of reality as the *Vedāntins* do. This latter, the *Trika* says, gives to time—*Kāla*—a substantiality which strengthens the potency of illusion. It is not, therefore, *Nityatva* but *Svātantrya* which becomes the criterion of *Sattā* or existentiality in the *Trika*. By this standard, every *Ābhāsa* is real as being a manifestation of power or *Sphurattā*. All other definitions of reality are relative and conventional.

For the *Trika*, the sphere of all experience is one's own nature—*Svabhāva*. This is the realm of *Adhyātman*. Like the *Gītā* it equates *Svabhāva* with *Adhyātman*: *Svabhāvo' dhyātmamucyate*. The concept of *Māyā*, too, has its place in the *Trika* scheme of *Tattvas*, where it is a kind of watershed or dividing-line. Here the *Tattva* called *Māyā*, whose functions of delusion—*Moha* or *Aviveka*—correspond to those in the *Advaita Vedānta*, becomes the universally limiting principle—*Kancuka*—or sheath, and occupies an intermediate position. It operates in a fivefold manner—each mode being a subordinate *Kancuka* or sheath—and is reckoned as a *Tattva*. These are, in order—

Kalā—limited doership, or restriction in respect of authorship or efficacy. It is *Kincitkartṛlva* as opposed to the *Sarvakarṭṛtva* of the Lord. This is the origin and root of the other four *Kancukas*—*Vidyā*, *Rāga*, *Niyatī* and *Kāla*.

Vidyā, otherwise called *Aśuddha Vidyā* in order to distinguish it from the higher *Tattva* or *Śuddha Vidyā* which we shall have occasion to mention later, is the limitation in respect of knowledge and is the basis of that everyday knowledge on which all *Vyavahāra* rests. *Rāga* means inclination or limitation in respect of desire. It is the power behind all choice, when an individual prefers something to the exclusion of all else. *Niyatī* is the power which restricts or limits the causal efficacy of everything. It is because of this that "fire only burns and the sesame sprout comes out of the sesame seed only." Last comes *Kāla* or the ordinary conception of time or temporal succession. These five *Kancukas* with *Māyā* as the sixth dominate *Puruṣa*, the 25th and last *Tattva* of the *Sāṁkhya* as adopted in the *Trika*.

Thus, we have in all, so far, 31 *Tattvas*. All together these pertain to the lower or impure path or *Aśuddha-adhva*, that which is below *Māyā*. The Self as identifying itself with these is called *Māyāpramātā* or *Paśu* or *Sakala*, *i.e.*, under the influence of *Kalā*. He is afflicted by ignorance which in this system is technically termed *Mala*, and is threefold: *Āṇava*, *Kārma* and *Māyīya*. *Āṇava* is the primary *Mala* on which depend the other two. It is that which transforms the soul into an *Aṇu* (atom), a small, limited and hence individual entity. It is the principle of individuation. *Kārmamala* is in essence what is known as *Karma* in ordinary parlance, which enchains the soul

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

by good and evil action. *Māyīyamala* is that which is responsible for the bodily form. According to the *Trika*, the realisation of *Puruṣa, i.e., Kaivalya*, confers freedom only from *Māyīyamala, i.e.*, that which is incidental to the possession of a body. The other two remain. They are shed only when *Māyā* is transcended.

Thus we come to that last lap in the "pilgrim's progress," which is above *Māyā* and is called the *Śuddha-adhva*. Here the cognizer has shed both *Kārma* and *Āṇava Mala*. He is no longer a *Paśu*, but the Master or *Pati*. He realises his own freedom or power—*Svātantrya*, by stages: first *Śuddhavidyā*, next *Īśvara*; then *Sadāśiva*, and lastly *Śakti* and *Śiva*. All together, we have the well-known scheme of the 36 *Tattvas* of the *Trika*. Above all and not counting as a *Tattva* is *Para Śiva* who transcends both *Sāmānya* and *Viśeṣa*. In regard to these *Tattvas* it has to be borne in mind that they are planes and not individuals. Each plane is a level of the cognizer, or subject, *Pramātā* or *Grāhaka*, corresponding to which there is an appropriate *Grāhya* or that which is cognized. At all these levels, however, it is the whole universe of experience—*Viśva* itself—that is cognized.

These levels will now be briefly described, beginning at the top. The Universal (*Sāmānya*) *Caitanya*, common to all aspects, pure and limited, is called *Śiva*, holding within itself all the *Viśeṣas*. The appearance of *Śiva* as *Aham*, the "I" principle, is called *Śakti*, its essence being the self-presentative character—*Ahambhāsana*. Then it dichotomises itself into an "I" *Aham*, and a "this," *Idam*. The *Idam* is not yet fully differentiated. According to the relative predominance of either of these two constituents we have the three grades—*Sadāśiva* in which *Aham* is dominant and *Idam* subordinate, *Īśvara* in which *Idam* is dominant and *Aham* secondary, and lastly *Śuddhavidyā* in which *Aham* and *Idam* are in balanced equilibrium, *Sāmānādhikaraṇya*, between the two principles. The respective cognizers, *Pramātās* or *Grāhakas* are—*Mantra* for the *Śuddhavidyā* stage, *Mantreśvara* for the *Īśvara* stage and *Mantramaheśvara* for the *Sadāśiva* stage.

This apparently confusing multiplicity of selves will soon be seen to be not a defect but the merit of the system. Even at the risk of further complicating the matter, it has to be added here, for the sake of completeness, that the scheme posits two other sets of cognizers between *Māyāpramātā* (*Sakala*) and *Mantra*. These are not under the sway of *Kalā*, the effective aspect of *Māyā*, and are hence called *Akala*. They are of two types: *Vijñānākala* and *Praḷayākala*. In the latter the potency of revival of ignorance exists, as in the case of a sleeping person who, when he wakes up, automatically resumes the obligations of waking life. The former, however, is not in danger of reverting to the original state.

The positing of seven *Pramātās* is so distinctive feature of this system that it would be well worth while to examine the matter at some length, even though it may look like a digression. That the Self which is ultimately one appears as many is one of the commonplaces of *Upaniṣadic* imagery. There is thus the famous allegory of two birds of glorious plumage on the same tree, one eating the sweet and bitter berries, while the other higher up looks on with lordly unconcern. These have been explained by commentators to stand for *Jīva* and *Īśvara* which are

State Museum, LUCKNOW.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

polarizations of one and the same Self. The *Gītā* too speaks of two selves befriending or antagonising each other, and how the higher can lift up the lower—*Uddhared ātmanā'tmānam.*

It also distinguishes between *Kṣetra* and *Kṣetrajña*, of which the former is the lower plane of the Self. This is brought out explicity by Manu who calls the animated *Kṣetra* by the name *Bhūtātmā*, the self identified with the body which carries out the bidding of the *Kṣetrajña.* This twofold classification would roughly correspond to the *Pramātās* of the *Śuddha-adhva* grouped together on the one hand—*Puruṣottama*, and the *Māyāpramātā—Puruṣa*—on the other. Then again in the *Upaniṣads* there is the crucial distinction between the states of waking, dreaming and deep sleep, and the self associated with each: *Vaiśvānara*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña.* Transcending these three and forming their support and substratum, there is a fourth or *Turīya.*

Comparable to this is the exposition in the *Taittirīya* of the five *Kośas*, *Annamaya*, etc., each of which can easily be associated with the appropriate *Abhimānī* self. These classifications are not like the inert categories of physical science which have to be reconciled with each other. But each set furnishes, as it were, its own symbolism for grappling with the complex experience of life, and its justification is the resulting simplification which takes the seeker one more step nearer the goal. It is in this light that the seven cognizers of the *Trika* have to be appraised. In a sense they are hypothetical, but they yield results (*Siddhi*) in the practical experience (*Sādhanā*) of those to whose *Saṁskāras* they prove congenial. The number seven, too, has its peculiar appeal and reminds one of the seven higher *Lokas* corresponding to the seven Vedic *Vyāhṛtis*, the seven seers, *Saptarṣis*, of the Veda and *Purāṇa*, the sevenfold stream (of consciousness?) '*Sapta-sindhu*, which is identified with *Sarasvatī*, the goddess of learning, the seven little Mothers (*Saptamātṛka*) who are her derivatives, the seven stages or levels of Yogic attainment (*Saptadhā prānta bhūmi prajñā*) referred to by Patanjali as well in the *Yoga Vāśiṣṭha* and other authoritative works on *Yoga*.

Modern psychology and psychical research have much to say regarding the multiplicity of selves. The simple empirical conscious self no longer appears as unitary. In the innermost self, every observer is conscious of a continuous silent discourse in which several entities seem to participate. In this inner world of discourse, as Santayana calls it, distinct selves can be recognized which are often in conflict. William James, the great American psychologist and philosopher, whom Whitehead referred to as "that adorable genius", says that it is possible to identify in one's own experience at least four selves: first, the material self as primarily associated with the body, then the social self, next the spiritual self and lastly the pure ego.

Each of these again appears to be composite. Thus he says of the social self—"Properly speaking, a man has as many social selves as there are individuals who recognize him and carry an image of him in their minds. To wound any one of these, his images, is to wound him. But as the individuals who carry these images fall naturally into classes, we may practically say that he has as

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

many different social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinion he cares. He generally shows a different side of himself to each of these different groups." Another reputed modern psychologist, Eric Fromm, while analyzing modern tendencies has pointed out in an acute study, *The Fear of Freedom*, that the vice of modern life is the sacrificing of the real self to the notion of the social self.

Psycho-analysts have carried the matter further by their investigations into the subconscious mind. There is in every man the vague region called the subconscious self, full of complexes each of which functions practically like a dissociated element of the self. There are, besides, recognizable groupings, each with a nucleus round which psychic elements are organized, which can be recognized as "shadow" selves. Jung names two of these as the Anima and the Persona. Freud, too, speaks of the Id and the Super-ego. Then again, psychopathology has revealed instances of split and multiple personalities—distinct and mutually exclusive—functioning at different times in the same body. Apart from all these are the powerful manifestations of the group mind, racial, national, linguistic, professional and so on, endlessly.

It is needless to multiply instances, but what stands out is that no phenomenon appears to be at all understandable unless it is interpreted as being animated by a Self—ultimately the self of the observer himself. This aboriginal "animism," as it might be called, is a basic fact which can never be got over. All language implies it. It is all the same whether the patriot says "England expects every Englishman to do his duty," or the literary enthusiast says "Kannada demands the devoted service of every Mysorean," or the scientist says "Matter shows an inclination to continue in its state of rest or of uniform motion in a straight line unless acted on by an alien force." Every word—force, energy, matter, tree, man, animal—is an animation of this type, the speaker himself endowing it with a kind of rudimentary self.

It is now high time to gather up the scattered threads of our thought. This will involve the use of further terminology, but it cannot be avoided. The Supreme Principle, we have seen, is not a mere actionless static Absolute but the repository of all power, not the neuter *Brahman* but *Maheśvara* himself. His dominant aspect is designated *Śakti*. From one aspect, *Śakti* is the all-comprehending consciousness (*Prakāśa*) otherwise called *Citi*. The effectiveness (*Siddhi*) of all manifestation (*Viśva*) is through *Citi* alone and this is designated *Svātantrya*. From another stand-point, *Śakti* is the manifestation of the Self as "I" (*Ahambhāsana*). It is called *Pūrṇāhantā* to distinguish it from the limited manifestation commonly known as *Ahaṁkāra*. It is a matter of everyday experience that the chief characteristic of the manifestation of the Self or "I" principle is reflection or *Vimarśa*. This is the hall-mark of the intelligent subject (*Cetana*) as opposed to the pure object (*Jaḍa*). Thus, according to the *Trika*, the highest reality is *Prakāśa-Vimarśa-maya*, whereas it is only *Śuddhaprakāśa* according to the *Vedānta*. *Citi* is independently the cause (*Kāraṇa*) of all manifestation through her own desire, *Svecchā*, and is the substratum (*Bhitti*) as well as the material (*Upādāna*) of such manifestation, which takes the shape of numerous subjects with their appropriate objects (*Anurūpa grāhya grāhaka*).

The *Grāhakas* fall into seven classes which have already been briefly explained. Essentially, there is only one basic division which separates the *Māyāpramātā* (in whom the subject and object are absolutely distinct owing to the operation of *Māyā* with her attendants—the five *Kancukas*) from the higher *Pramātās* of the *Śuddhādhva* for whom there is an unlimited subject-object. But *Māyā* is not other than *Citi*, but only a principle of limitation (*Saṁkoca*), which is itself a mark of *Svātantrya*, being self-imposed. In the stage of *Māyā*, *Citi* herself becomes the limited mind or *Citta*. *Citi* descends through graduated *Saṁkoca* to the level of *Citta*. The aim of spiritual attainment or enlightenment is to reach back to the stage of *Citi*, when the *Saṁkoca* is laid aside and *Svātantrya* is realized, or rather it is seen that *Saṁkoca* itself is a manifestation of *Svātantrya* which can be assumed or discarded at pleasure. This is the stage of *Pati* as opposed to *Paśu*. It is attained through recollection of one's own essential state which has always co-existed with all the apparent limitations, but had not been recognized as such. This recognition is what is known as *Pratyabhijñā*. The crucial point in the path is thus crossing over *Māyā* into the region known as *Śuddhavidyā* in which Selfhood, *Ahantā*, is associated not with the body, gross or subtle, but with words or *Mantra*. Here, *Mantra* is *Grāhaka*, or really *Grāhya-Grāhaka*, a notion which is fundamental for the entire system. If once this is grasped the rest becomes much easier.

The very body of the *Śuddhādhva*, that world of inner discourse which we have referred to, is *Vimarśa* or reflection. But reflection is inseparable from speech (*Vāk*). Thus *Śakti* which we have seen to be *Purṇāhantā* which is only another name for *Vimarśa*, is from another angle identical with *Parāvak* or speech (*Vak*) in its ultimate form. But here *Vāk* must not be understood as a mere physical phenomenon, but rather as that primeval psychic energy of which words are mere symbols. The immaterial universe is not other than *Vācya* and *Vācaka*, substance and speech, the former having its affinity to *Prakāśa* and the latter to *Vimarśa*, although the two are not really separable.

The essence of *Parāvak* is word-formation (*Śabdana*), not in the gross audible form but in that most subtle one which is itself the core of all self-consciousness. At one end it is independent of all verbal conventions while at the other, *i.e.*, in the stage of *Māyā*, it is the substratum of all such conventions. At the source, substance and speech are one, and it is only in the state of *Māyā* that they appear to have separate existence. Speech (*Vāk*) has four stages or levels. When the desire for manifestation has just raised its head and become self-conscious, the condition is comparable to that of a seed about to germinate. This is called *Paśyantī* : that which sees itself. Here *Vācya* and *Vācaka* are not yet differentiated. Next comes *Madhyamā* or the intermediate stage, that which immediately precedes articulate speech, in which, although idea and word are distinguishable, they are as yet imbedded in a common substratum from which they do not stand out. The last stage is that of gross audible uttered speech—*Vaikharī*, which has its manifestation in the world of *Māyā*.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

This in brief is the doctrine of *Vāk* which is as old as the Vedas. The *Ṛgveda* clearly mentions the four stages of *Vāk*, of which only one is uttered, while the remaining three are hidden in the cave (of the heart) and are recognized only by sages: *Catvāri vāk parimitā padāni, tāni vidur brāhamaṇā yé manīṣinaḥ; guhā trīni nihitā nengayanti, turīyam vāco manuṣyā vadanti.* There is also the celebrated *Sūkta* in which *Vāk* apostrophises herself as the source of the Veda and as the basis of all *Devatās* and *Mantras.* This is the origin of the theory of *Śabda Brahṃan* which is accepted by many orthodox *Darśanas.* This is the *Sphoṭavāda* of the grammarians, so eloquently expounded by *Bhartṛhari* and others.

Prior to the formation of words and sentences comes the manifestation of the letters of the alphabet: the *Varṇas.* The sounds of the Sanskrit alphabet starting with "*A*" and ending with "*Ha*" symbolically represent the whole gamut (*Varṇamālā*) of reflection or *Vimarśa,* forming the word *Aham* which comprehends within itself the potentiality of all self-consciousness. Each and every sound is a *Mātṛkā* or living energy, inseparable from the quality of the *Citta* of the speaker. These sounds are conceived not as being created by the speaker but as self existent and only uttered (*Uccāra*). Sometimes *Kṣa* is taken as the last sound and the *Varṇamālā* then becomes *Akṣamālā*, the rosary being its physical equivalent. It is significant that *Akṣara* stands for each letter of the alphabet, and also for the totality of sounds.

The unitary *Akṣara* stands for the Supreme indestructible *Brahman* in the *Upaniṣads*, where it is described as That by knowing which all else becomes known. It is comparable to the single *Mātṛkā* of the *Tantra* and *Mantraśāstra*, which is the root or source (*Yoni*) of all sounds, and to the *Paśyantī* stage of *vāk*. Meditations on individual sounds and description of the results they yield in the course of *Sādhanā* abound in the *Upaniṣads*. A typical example is the meditation on the sound *OM* (*Omkāra*) and of its component elements *A*, *U*, and *M*. This type of meditation on what are called *Bījākṣaras* has been greatly developed in the *Śākta Tantras* and the *Trika* as well as in the *Purāṇas* and the *Āgamas*.

In the *Trika* the utmost importance is attached to the sounds of the alphabet itself as primary *Bījākṣaras* and the substratum of all *Mantras*, and to *Mantra* in general as the basic element in all the three types of *Grāhakas* known as *Mantra*, *Mantreśvara* and *Mantramāheśvara*. Thus *Śuddhavidyā*, *Īśvara* and *Sadāśiva* are compact of *Mantra-vīrya* or energy, and *Puṛṇāhantā* is the top limit of *Mantra-vīrya*. It is only through the achievement of *Mantravīrya* that the true nature of *Śakti* and *Śiva* can be realised. *Mantra* is the principal form of *Sādhanā* suited to the stage of the *Sādhaka*, the *Āṇavopāya* for the lowest grade, comprising external ritual, the *Śāktopāya* made up mainly of mental practice or *Mantrasādhanā*, and the *Śāmbhavopāya* for the highest class of *Sādhakas* who rely only on the state (*Bhāva*) produced by deep and penetrative spiritual insight and not involving specific practices, physical or mental. Above all comes "the method which is not method"—*Anupāya*—which consists in effortless recollection of the supreme state. This is *Pratyabhijñā* proper.

This is a very brief and scrappy conspectus of the entire system. Every word in it is capable of voluminous

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

explanation, but that would be to miss the very spirit of the system which lies not in amplification of verbal explanations (*vikalpas*), but in the going backwards, the condensation and ultimate dissolution of all speech, when first the *Madhyamā* stage of speech is grasped in its essence and then merged in the undifferentiated *Paśyantī* which is *Nirvikalpa* and identical with *Sadāśiva*. The next step, of course, cannot be spoken of in words. It is *Anuttara*.

Now for some concluding remarks. It has already been observed that the system combines in itself the good points of many other systems. First, its ultimate findings (*Siddhāntas*) are in perfect agreement with the highest utterances of the *Upaniṣads* which are the admitted high-water mark of Indian experience. But no break is effected with the tradition of the Veda, which presents the Supreme Reality as the repository (*Śaktimat*) of power (*Śakti*). It is in entire consonance with the spirit of the Vedas, the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads* that in the *Trika*, too, the manifestation of *Śakti* is primarily through *Mantra*. In the Veda, wherever the word *Māyā* occurs it is always in the sense of variegated power (*Śakti*) generally associated with *Indra;* and never in the sense of illusion as in the later *Vedānta*. The *Trika* is, therefore, on the best ground in accepting the principle of *Śakti* in preference to *Māyā*. By this preference, it is enabled to cross over that rejection of the actual world of phenomena as unreal, a notion which has, as it were, cast a pall over the mind of India and induced a pernicious anæmia of the spirit through the centuries, with all its ghastly consequences, political and other. In the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Rresevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Trika we enter at once a healthier atmosphere, where it becomes possible once again to take the world and its affairs seriously, but in their right perspective. There is no sacrifice of one world for another, which has been the bane of most of the higher religious and philosophical disciplines all the world over.

Next, the approach is not through a rigid and uncompromising logic as in the *Śānkara Vedānta*, with its glorification of asceticism (*Sannyāsa*) on the one hand and its final appeal to the authority of *Śruti* on the other. The *Trika* approach is not through logic so much as through psychology. Starting with common-place everyday experience it proceeds step by step to higher realms, using the reason—as well as the creative imagination. There is no appeal to authority at any stage, or any special claim to esotericism, for even the *Guru's* function here is of very limited scope, and at every crucial turn it is the seeker alone who can help himself. Neither austerities nor any particular mode of life are prescribed, nor is the initiation restricted to any particular caste or creed. It is open to all who seek it, although the fruition will be most rapid in those whose *Saṁskāras* have prepared them for it, in whom has occurred what is technically termed the descent of *Śakti* (*Śaktipāta*) which is not other than the grace (*Anugraha*) of the Supreme Lord.

The discipline is graded and provides for contemplation as well as ritual activity (*Karma*) for those who need it. The scheme, too, is not a bare skeleton of *Tattvas*, but its higher categories—*Śiva* and *Śakti*—are such as could be clothed with flesh and blood by the imagination so as to serve as the substratum of devotion (*Bhakti*).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

But yet *Bhakti* is not allowed to monopolize the whole stage as in the dualistic (*Dvaita*) system to the exclusion of all else. The seeker does not plunge headlong in a vortex of emotion and drown his discrimination (*viveka*). While adopting the stand-point of *Śakti*, those extremes of practice which have given a bad name to the exclusive *Śakti* cults are at the same time avoided. *Śakti* is prevented from losing her balance by the constant presence of *Śiva*. This stress on the experience of *Śakti* prevents the aim of this school from being merely a negative freedom as in other systems, whether it be the *Jīvanmukti* of the *vedāntins* or the *Nirvāṇa* of the Bauddhas. It is not a mere release of the *Paśu* from his bonds (*Pāśa*), but it is at the same time an acquiring of the power in freedom —*Svātantrya*, *Aiśvarya* and *Patibhāva*. Thus is avoided the common reproach against idealism that it degenerates into solipsism, for here it is not the limited empirical self of everyday experience, (*Māyāpramātā*) who is the creator of the ideal world of experience but *Īśvara*—a Self who, although different from the *Māyāpramātā* is yet co-present with him in the experience not merely of the *Yogin* but indeed of every man. The procedures used in this system allow full scope for harmonious combination with other systems of *Yoga*, *e.g.*, the *Kuṇḍalinī Yoga*, *Kuṇḍalinī* being no other than the *Vākśakti* of the *Trika*. But trance conditions are not requisite for the highest realization which is quite consistent with the waking experience. The Supreme Reality is not something special (*viśeṣa*), but indeed the most fundamental basis of all experience (*Sāmānya*, *Citi* or *Caitanya*). This is, however, considered not as a homogeneous entity, which would be inert (*jaḍa*) but symbolically as a twin (*Yāmala*, *Saṁghaṭṭa* or *Mithuna*) of *Śiva* and *Śakti*, of *Prakāśa* and *vimarśa*. This union results in the highest ecstasy (*Ānanda*). In judging any *Darśana*, however, extraneous considerations like its rationality or its affinities are not the final test, but only the test is its efficacy. The test is whether it will deliver the goods. Those who have tried the *Trika* give the answer in an unmistakable affirmative.

SUCCESS *

It is as pleasant to give advice as it is disagreeable to receive it. I remember similar functions in my student days when well-meaning elders would tell us how we should conduct ourselves, and try to instil in us a whole catalogue of virtues, *e.g.*, integrity, diligence, honesty and so on *ad nauseam*. I am afraid we did not pay much heed to the excellent advice, but on the contrary we were so perverse as to make fun of the worthy people who tendered it. Now that it is my own turn to give advice, I fear that you might accord to me the same irreverent treatment as we gave to our seniors at an earlier stage. I shall therefore try to ward off your criticism by avoiding the direct giving of advice, and offering you a few suggestions on matters of common interest which I hope will set your minds working to some purpose. In fact, it is a curious trait of human nature that it has a tendency to reject whatever is directly thrust on it, while accepting without much questioning, things suggested in an indirect manner. This feature has been the subject of investigation by psychologists and has given rise to a school of thought connected with the name of Dr. Coué, a Frenchman. One of the results of his experiments and those of his disciples has been designated 'the law of reversed effort' which states that if we try to do anything by an effort of will-power, there is often something in our nature which not only resists it, but even increases the obstruction in the way of attainment, whereas the same thing could be achieved with ease in an indirect manner. It is rather strange that much which corresponds to this finds a place in the ancient Hindu *Śāstras*. We thus see in the Veda that the *Devas* (who presumably reside in the human body) are fond of an indirect approach: *parokṣa priyā vai devāḥ*. I shall therefore try to obviate any resistance which you may unconsciously offer to me, by adopting an indirect and suggestive mode of approach to your minds.

---

* Abstract of an Address delivered in 1937 to passed students at Bangalore.

When we come to examine the origins of this peculiar phenomenon in human psychology, we at once come upon the idea of the unconscious. This is a concept which has been developed very largely in modern times as a result of investigations which have shown that man's mind is like an iceberg of which only one-tenth is visible and the remaining nine-tenths is submerged. A whole department of psychology has grown up under the name of psycho-analysis, whose avowed object is to probe into the submerged portion of man's mind. We would not be wrong in saying that the chief difference between the attitude of modern men towards certain problems and that of their forbears a century ago, lies in the emphasis laid on the part played in men's affairs by the unconscious. It used to be thought that men's conscious motives, *i.e.*, those which he was able to recognise and reason about were all that counted. But it is now admitted on all hands that there is an unconscious element in man's personality which though submerged, influences all his actions and even thoughts from beneath, and that some of his principal problems are due to the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

working of what have been called 'complexes' buried in the region of the unconscious. These play their part in such a disguised manner that he is unable to recognise their true origin. The main thing to remember about the unconscious is that it is composed almost wholly of repressed ideas, which for one reason or another are withheld from consciousness, and that its substance is emotional and dynamic. We shall not be able correctly to understand either our own nature or that of our fellow-beings unless we take into account the workings of this hidden but potent factor. The point which I should like to emphasise just now is that in contradistinction to the conscious mind which is primarily intellectual, the content of the unconscious is mostly emotional.

Many of our personal and social problems, I would repeat, have their roots in this submerged portion of man's personality. This accounts for the paradox that although most men know what is right, they still pursue furtively, courses which they know to be wrong, but yet have not the courage to resist. The direction of cure for this is to recognise the part played by the unconscious in our mental make-up and functioning, and to reach that emotional integrity which alone will help us to lead an equable and balanced life. Westerners have only recently realised the importance of these facts, and they have not yet developed a satisfactory technique for dealing with the psychoses or neuroses from which most men suffer, including even those who are considered normal and mentally healthy. It is one of the merits of our ancient books that they had not only recognised the existence of the unconscious, but had also developed elaborate and sometimes secret techniques for dealing with it. It is too big a subject for me to broach, except by way of merely mentioning it. It will suffice to say here that the practice of *Yoga* and the rituals of worship have all a very profound connection with the integrating and harmonising of man's submerged emotional personality. I do not ask you to start practising any of these, but only to think of them as entitled to a more respectful consideration than educated Hindus have been according to them in recent times, and to avoid dismissing them with scant courtesy as primitive superstitions.

I shall now refer to another aspect of the subject. I have stressed the emotional and unconscious elements in the human personality, in order to point out that culture is not purely an intellectual affair. It is not a mere combination of intellectual capacity and versatility. On the other hand, according to our ideas, real culture is impossible unless a person has a harmonised emotional personality in which his complexes do not obstruct the realization of his highest aspirations. The stress in culture, I feel, should be more on the emotional side of man's nature than on the intellectual, especially in the circumstances of the modern world. We should revive the old Hindu ideal of culture. The Sanskrit equivalent of the word culture is *vyavasāya*, and the *Bhagavad Gītā* tells us:

> *Vyavasāyātmikā buddhirekeha Kurunandana,*
> *Bahuśākhā hyanantāśca buddhayo' vyavasāyinām.*

In interpreting the word *Buddhi* here I would ask you not to give too intellectual a significance to it, but to

State Museum, LUCKNOW.

understand thereby man's whole psychic personality, including the unconscious and emotional elements. The *Śloka* will then mean that the cultured personality is that which is unified and integrated while that which has too many directions is the reverse. Let me emphasise that the verse does not merely refer to intellectual concentration as contrasted with the distracted mind. My present purpose will however be served if I can persuade you to avoid equating many-sidedness with true culture.

One more aspect of the subject has to be dealt with: I must not forget that I am addressing the passed students. I do not wish to undervalue success, but success is not everything in life. The tendency in these days is to praise success and to cry down failure. For some, indeed success is the only virtue, and failure the only crime! Let us avoid this and remember that one may succeed throughout one's career and yet be intrinsically a failure and miss the best values in life. There is a certain ultimate good, a *summum bonum*, which can coexist even with failure. To miss it would be to miss the whole end of life, and the greatest material success would be but poor compensation for it. I believe that it must have been with reference to such a possibility that Jesus Christ uttered the warning that it would be small profit if a man should gain the whole world but lose his own soul in the process. I would not however dwell too much on the antithesis between the world and the soul, but would rather impress on you the Hindu ideal of *Puruṣārtha*, the objective of all real culture, in which the normal satisfaction of the worldly ends *Artha* and *Kāma* is coupled with and balanced by their complements: *Dharma* and *Mokṣa*.

I shall now sum up the points which I have dwelt on today. There is a large unconscious element in our personality which influences our thoughts and actions. Its content is primarily of an emotional as distinguished from an intellectual nature. It is possible for us to come to terms with this unconscious element, so that it may not only not be an obstruction to the realisation of the highest goal in life, but even be a help. This goal which has been compendiously termed *Puruṣārtha* in our sacred books, is not identical with material success although not incompatible with it. It consists in a harmonious development in which all the components of our personality find their fullest expression. Such a state alone is true culture, and it is my earnest desire that all of us should seek to attain it.

It is now my pleasant duty to congratulate those who have been successful, and at the same time, to tell the less fortunate that they should not be unduly depressed over their failure. Let us remember that there is a good in life which transcends success and failure. May it be ours!

PROGRESS*

A GREAT change has come over men's minds and outlook all over the world. The ferment is especially active in the mind of the younger generation. Everybody feels that the fruits of the commonly held doctrine equating civilization with mechanical progress have not been very savoury. This does not mean however that the results of scientific advancement have to be discarded and that we have to return to a state of primitive nature, but that they have to be supplemented by those humane ideals which actuated the great civilizations and religions of the past. As in the story of Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp it would appear as if we have not been wholly gainers by exchanging the old lamp for the new.

During the last War we never fully realised what it all meant. Today the War has come nearer to us in all its horror and we are living every moment in the apprehension that we may all be engulfed in the whirlpool here in India. At such a time it behoves all of us to see that our sympathies are on the right side and that we exert ourselves to the utmost, practically and morally, not merely to resist any invader who may come from outside but mainly the insidious forces of lawlessness and disorder which may raise their head inside the country.

The prevailing state of affairs is a direct challenge to the light-hearted theories of progress which have held men's imaginations for over a century. It cannot be explained away as a mere off-shoot not directly in the line of civilized advance but a diversion. We may well enquire seriously whether there are not grave defects in the outlook itself which have brought nemesis in their train, and which unless speedily remedied will destroy civilization itself.

---

* Abstract of the Inaugural Address delivered before the Intermediate College Association, Shimoga, in 1942.

The civilized world of today is justly proud of two things: its ideal of democracy in the political and social spheres and its scientific outlook and achievements. The bases of a true democracy however do not seem to have been appreciated. Real democracy does not consist of a faith in numbers or the divine right of the majority; nor is civilization that kind of progress which can be measured in statistics. Democracy is only too apt to degenerate into a worship of mediocrity and into a mere political expedient unless broad-based on the sacredness of human life and the divinity that resides in every individual. The foundations of democracy should be spiritual and not utilitarian or materialistic. It was such a concept that was embodied in the Hindu ritual of *vaiśvadeva* and *Atithi Pūjā.* It would be a good thing if today we could revive its spirit.

The achievements of science cannot be belittled. But we need not go to the other extreme of exaggeration. Science has brought incalculable gains to humanity; but it has also brought in its wake endless misery and is brewing the seeds of more. Essentially it is a method adapted for dealing with the inanimate world of matter. Deification of this method and its adaptation to spheres to which it is not suited have been its bane. The best results can be achieved only when it is kept in its own

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

place and not allowed to usurp the place of the human spirit. It must always be subsidiary to human ends and personality. Otherwise the machine and its mentality rule the world and man becomes the slave of the machine, than which there can be no greater disaster. The Universe in its purely mechanical aspect is a big soulless machine : *Prakṛti*. It has no meaning apart from the soul or *Puruṣa*. Hindu philosophy maintained the proper balance by asserting the supremacy of *Puruṣa*, and saying that *Prakṛti* functioned for the sake of the *Puruṣa*. This was the ideal of *Puruṣārtha* which is the most harmonious and wholesome that has yet been evolved by man.

In the sphere of science the greatest advances were made only after the recognition of the conservation of energy. Some such principle of concervation seems to rule in the world of human values also. We cannot have something for nothing, but every gain has to be paid for, sometimes dearly. The gains of mechanical science have all been paid for although we have not counted our losses. An unbiassed retrospect will show that even the so-called Dark Ages possessed and cherished ideals like honour and chivalry, of religious exaltation and ecstacy which are not very much in evidence today. It would appear as if a law of compensation or retribution lay at the back of things. Such a recognition was the basis of the well-known but much misunderstood doctrine of *Karma*. A right understanding of this principle will restore the balance and reconcile apparently conflicting ideals. This synthetic outlook constitutes the glory and ornament of Hindu culture.

The outlook was not restricted to mere theory but had its own unique practical aspects. Instead of concentrating on the outer world, stress was laid on the inner instrument of apprehension: the *Antaḥkaraṇa.* Tools and machines were not developed but the mind was tuned to a fine one-pointedness: *Ékāgra buddhi,* and this led on to the development of faculty or *Siddhi.* But the matter was not allowed to rest there. Even *Siddhis* were considered to be but obstacles in the path of spiritual progress, whose goal was the supreme vision in which all opposites were harmonised. The result was *Samatva* or *Samadarśana*: the balanced vision which is the goal of the method of self-culture known as *Yoga*, which was at once a philosophy and a discipline. Only through some such process can spiritual democracy be achieved.

I would emphasise the fact that these results were actually realised and are realisable today. This has been proclaimed in no uncertain language in the *Gītā* and the *Upaniṣads.* This does not necessarily involve a renunciation of the world and its activities. I think it was the devil who prompted the gibe about making the best of both worlds. Hindu experience is emphatically to the contrary. *Vyavahāra* and *paramārtha* can be combined and have to be combined: like Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna, or *Śiva* and *Śakti.* In such a combination alone lies the salvation of humanity.

WHITHER PSYCHOLOGY?

It is usual to say that psychology is the youngest among the sciences. But in a sense psychology is the oldest of the sciences. There is good reason for holding that, even in the earliest reaches of human history, man was preoccupied with the workings of his own mind and had learnt how to apply his findings, and primitive man was not concerned only, or even chiefly, with objective matters. On the other hand, he saw mind everywhere in the Universe, an attitude which it has been usual in recent times to designate by the somewhat deprecatory title of animism. His findings were, however, not embodied in theories and principles so much as in myths, legends and allegories, and in the whole vast realm of art, ritual and religion. Subsequent developments in the course of the great ancient civilizations are well-known, although it is to be feared that they have not been given their due weight by moderns.

With the renascence of science in its modern guise three or four centuries ago, the stress was shifted on definitely to the outer world. The success of the experimental method in these regions was so phenomenal that the method has come to be regarded as almost sacrosanct. The resulting view of the universe was a mechanistic one, and at its basis were the so-called "laws of nature" which explained nature's obvious uniformities. The same method was sought to be applied to biology and latterly to psychology also. Its success in the new field was, however, not so marked as in the region of the physical sciences, and, as a result, non-mechanistic hypotheses have had to be adopted by many investigators, and have been fruitful. This is all the more the case in the region of psychology where the purely mechanistic experimental methods wherever applicable have no doubt yielded results to match, but have not taken us very far towards understanding the fundamental problems. There has thus been scope for the greatest variety of opinion even as regards basic concepts. The problem has been further complicated by the fact that the latest findings of the physical sciences themselves do not support a mechanistic determinism, such, for example, as fully satisfied a man like Huxley at the close of the last century. Today the barriers between mind, matter and energy have broken down, as it were, and it would require a very bold imagination indeed to predict what the future has in store for us in these directions.

If we restrict our attention solely to modern psychology itself, we find that the old intellectualist view has been altogether abandoned. In its place a dynamic conception of the mind has been practically universally accepted. Mind is no longer regarded as a mere epiphenomenon, but rather as something geared on to the body, and through the body to the external world. The phenomena of the interaction of mind and body, although known from times immemorial, were apt to be dismised with scant courtesy as faith cures by the older psychologists. However, in the recent past, the facts which have come to light as a result of the systematic study of hypnosis, suggestion, trance conditions, hysteria and other abnormal but perfectly natural and common conditions have convinced psychologists that mind is connected with a vast hidden source of energy. Most psychologists have agreed on the name *libido* to designate this mind energy.

The chief fact which came to the forefront as a result of these investigations was that the reservoir of this energy was in a region of which we are ordinarily unaware. It would appear as if our mind is like an iceberg, the greater bulk of which is submerged below the threshold of consciousness. The credit of drawing attention to the workings of the subconscious or unconscious mind belongs to Freud, the Viennese psychologist, who passed away recently in England, an exile from his native country. His achievement in the region of psychology has been compared by so competent a judge as McDougall to that of Newton in physics, an achievement independent of the actual fate of his working hypotheses such as repression, the Oedipus-complex, the pleasure and reality principles and the like. The work begun by Freud was carried on by a host of famous investigators like Jung and Adler who have put forward very plausible rival hypotheses of their own. These are not mere speculations but are actually being daily used by these investigators in their clinical practice, and, it is claimed, with success.

The fundamental differences in theory coupled with empirical success are things which have intrigued many scientists who are used to the cut and dried methods of the physical sciences, where the latest successful hypothesis generally discredits and ousts its predecessors. In physics, except perhaps in the recent researches connected with Relativity, there seems to be little scope for option. On the other hand, in psychology, everything seems to be a matter of option. It is therefore being asserted by some that psychology has not yet assumed the status of a science. If by this is meant that it has not attained the rigidity of the physical sciences, it is only too true. It is unlikely that it ever will. It is just dawning on the minds of a very few investigators that psychology may require a method of its own, which may radically differ from the orthodox scientific method. It may even be said that psychology will not come into its own, unless it declares its independence and severs the umbilical chord which connects it with the physical sciences.

What is of the greatest interest to us is the fact that the results of the most modern investigations are very much in a line with the time-honoured findings of the great religions and mythologies. The rigid logic of solid matter which works so well in the world of physical science does not apparently hold undisputed sway in the region of mind. Man's imagination, which seems to form the core of his living and creative mind, seems to have a logic of its own, which is more to be discovered in the working of dreams and visions than in dealings with inanimate matter. The practical effects of this new orientation have been of far-reaching consequence. It has altered our attitude towards mental abnormality, whether it be in the shape of insanity or of the host of vital social problems like crime and education. The success of the physical sciences has placed an enormous amount of mechanical power in man's hands which only too often finds its outlet in undesirable channels like war. The prevention of such phenomena is a thing which is closely connected with the training of man's mind and emotions and not on the accumulation of external information. The great modern plagues are all of a psychical nature and can be cured only in the minds of people. For this, the hope does not lie in mechanism but only in personality. The solution lies not in the region of inanimate nature or energy (*prakṛti*), on the control of which man is now priding himself and comparing himself to his own advantage with pre-scientific man, but in the sphere of personality or *puruṣa*. The mighty civilizations of old seem to have been not only greatly concerned with this region but also to have achieved a large measure of success. It is up to us to use their sane and balanced findings, adapting them, of course, to modern requirements. There need not be any slavish submission to tradition or authority, nor is it necessary to suppose that the ancients had exhausted all the secrets of mind. There is nothing to prevent us from experimenting and finding out new things for ourselves. But we would be wise if we make a judicious use of the lore of the ancients. There is scope for criticism, provided it is made with respect and humility. Today I am putting forward a plea for a reverent study of the ancient literature on the subject. The great secrets and tried methods are there, but not all on the surface. Like the ancients, we may yet unravel in solitude, and through meditation, the live strands which form the warp and woof of mind. Man's mind which is the kernel of his inmost being, cherished and nourished by the five senses, like *Draupadi* by her five husbands, will never be exposed in public!

EDUCATION OF THE EMOTIONS*

It is a commonplace to say that we are passing through very unusual times. They are indeed not peculiar to Mysore or even to India, but are shared by us with the rest of the world. They are not due to the War but are traceable to causes of which the War itself is but a symptom and an offshoot. We are concerned today mainly with their educational aspect. The educational world today is in a state of acute upheaval. The boys have come out of the schools and colleges and no amount of persuasion or coercion whether on the part of the authorities or parents seems to have had much effect in making them go back. The girls are in it too, strange to say. In fact it would appear as if it is their enthusiasm which is the greater and their presence which is putting the boys on their mettle. The phenomenon was not taken seriously to start with. It was believed to be a passing effervescence. But now it looks as if it is something more deep-seated. That the boys are not going to school is the least anxious part of it. We are facing no less than what may be called the revolt of youth. It would appear as if there has been a complete reversal of values. The older and younger generations seem to have completely got out of gear with each other and to be speaking different and mutually incomprehensible languages. The indirect consequences of such a state of affairs are even more grave. They have set a premium on in-discipline and even encouraged a disregard for all organised life. Not very long ago when I had occasion to address the students at Shimoga, I uttered a word of warning in this behalf and appealed to them to keep their sympathies on the side of order and discipline. I felt then that a crisis was coming on, but I little dreamt that we would be in the midst of it in less than a fortnight. Today the best minds are anxiously struggling to find out a solution for this impasse, laymen as well as professional educationists. Let us put our heads together this evening and see if we cannot contribute our humble mite towards finding a remedy.

---

* Abstract of the Inaugural Address delivered before the Undergraduate Teachers' Association, Mysore, in 1942.

Before finding a remedy however, the trouble has to be diagnosed. Let us see what others think of it. A very recent book by H. G. Wells: *The Outlook for Homo Sapiens* deals with these absorbing questions. It is thought-provoking, although I do not think much of his solutions. In his preliminary survey based on a wealth of scientific data, he draws attention to the biological significance of the fact that there is a surplus of young men in the world today. As he says: "Young men, full of beans as people say, and looking for trouble. Hitherto, historians have failed to recognise the great importance of this trouble-making stratum. It is well to underline it here. It is a primary social fact." He goes on to say, "Something had to be done to and for these young men, and the easiest way of keeping them out of mischief, keeping them disciplined in fact and the numbers of them down, was war." "The young man surplus, if it is not consumed, is the main source of rebels, revolutionaries and disturbances of all kinds." This has given rise to a tension the acuteness of which has been augmented up to breaking point by the feverish tempo of scientific advance and the stress and strain of a machine civilization. "Somehow that tension must find relief and he finds relief in any *ism* that offers itself. . . . The essential fact is the accumulating tension of unsatisfied youth, and these *isms* are merely formulæ of relief."

So far we may agree with Wells. However, when he proceeds to seek remedies solely in the external sphere of social organization he ignores the fact that such tension is mainly a psychological phenomenon. He pays scant attention to the findings of modern psychology. The most outstanding discovery and achievement of modern psychology is to show to what an extent our mental life operates at subconscious levels, and how the mainsprings of conduct lie in the deep-seated instincts and emotions. Hitherto, civilization has been mainly an intellectual enterprise for the control of the resources of the environment. Educational theory and practice have weakly followed suit and have been concerned with the conscious rational fringe of the mind which was considered mainly as an instrument for problem-solving. But recent psychological studies regarding the emotions and behaviour distinctive of early childhood, and the significance of the great emotional reconstruction called adolescence, have made a change in the entire outlook. If this changed outlook should embody itself in practice, education will become largely a question of the wise expression and control of the emotions, and civilization itself essentially a system for the control of the emotional life in a comprehensive fashion. To show to what extent

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

indeed has the pendulum swung to the other extreme, We may note that a well-known psychologist has said that the human race is by nature hysterical: All primitive peoples are hysterical, children are notably hysterical, and the steadiest of us are likely to become so under severe stress; so that the problem of civilization is to reduce the native hysteria of the human race. Social menaces like fanaticism appear to be hysterical excesses. The difficulty in establishing rational conduct lies in this predisposition to hysteria and he considers that the essential aim of education is to provide for emotional stability and control by subduing and directing to desirable ends (sublimating) the native hysterical trends.

The wise expression and control of the emotions is indeed not a new idea. We seem to have come back by a devious route to the goal of the classical civilizations, whether it be in India or China, Egypt or Greece or Rome: the making of a gentleman. That was the aim of the grand old mythologies, and the time-honoured disciplines of all the great religions provided for training and graded emotional satisfaction. It is a fallacy of the times to think that satisfaction can only come through economic and political ideals. It was recognised long ago that man doth not live by bread alone. I am not pleading for a revival of the old religions, lock, stock and barrel. Such a thing would not be possible even granting it were desirable. But we shall wholly miss their import and significance if we do not realise that they performed a most essential twofold function: on the one hand, they reached down into the depths and recesses of the soul or psyche and provided relief (what the Greeks called *katharsis*): the much needed ventilation and sanitation of the subconscious region; on the other, they gave wings to the soaring spirit of man and made it possible for him to have moods of blessedness and exaltation and mystic ecstasy. In both ways they made it easier for man to live the sane rational life in the middle plane of the work-a-day world.

The decay of the old religions and mythologies left a void in men's hearts which could not be filled up by any external goods. They felt dimly that it would be but little profit though a man were to gain the whole world if he should lose his soul in the bargain. Undoubtedly it was with a view to fill up the void, however imperfectly, that new religion-substitutes like Fascism and Nazism came into being. Only thus can we understand their grip on men's minds and the appeal of their new mythologies and rituals. These ideologies started early enough with the child and have thus got ready today the men with the *rājasic* and *tāmasic* fervour requisite for their sinister purposes. I am afraid the democracies have nothing parallel to show and hence their comparative weakness. They may well take a leaf from the totalitarians but adapt their technique to *sāttvic* ends. There would be nothing derogatory in this. Do we not read in the *Purāṇas* that when the fortunes of the *Devas* were at a low ebb and the *Asuras* were in their heyday, *Bṛhaspati* sent his son *Kaca* to learn wisdom from *Śukra*, the Guru of the *Asuras*?

That is how we may read the present-day conflicts and tensions, whether it be the War, or the upheaval in the student world. It is an uprising with dynamic and destructive force from the subconscious, like an earthquake, of tendencies which have been repressed for nearly a century, ever since Darwin's *Origin of Species* was published, and a humane classical education gave place to one predominantly scientific and impersonal. The balance should be urgently restored. For this purpose assuredly, we need mythologies and rituals but these must be grounded in the nation's past and be true to the racial memories (*Saṁskāras*) and conform to its highest ideals. They must at the same time be adapted to the modern temperament and taste. In India there is no lack of material. In fact there is a plethora of it. *Yoga* and *Yajña* in their proper perspective and context, are not superstition. They are effective and necessary. They are only waiting for us to tap their tried resources and strength. The satisfactions they bring are ultimately independent of contemporary social organization and bear fruit in the individual almost immediately. Each such individual will become a quiet centre radiating the beneficent influence which will soon permeate society itself.

I would urge that it is only through individuals who have cultivated the requisite emotional balance that there can be any hope for the future; and not through any mere changes in the educational curriculums. I am not pleading that the *Purāṇas* should be included in the programme of studies. Nor do I want any comparative and critical scholarship of the type made fashionable here by foreigners: holding an inquest over the bones from which life has fled. Let us also not be impatient for mass results. That is a form of greed which not only stultifies itself but often results in contraries. Greed in any form is bad, whether for scientific knowledge or even for the good. It is this insidious greed that has brought the world to the present pass. Let us have none of it. Remember the great saying of the *Upaniṣad*:

> *Iśāvāsyamidam sarvam yat kinca jagatyām jagat;*
> *Tena tyakténa bhunjīthā mā gṛdhaḥ kasya svid dhanam.*

That is the only formula for the saving of the world. I can think of no other: *Nānyaḥ panthā vidyate’yanāya.* Teachers, teach the young people under your care on these lines and you will be paving the way for a wiser, a happier and more disciplined generation. Let that be your noble mission.

THE GROWTH OF SCIENCE *

A SURVEY

DR. WHITEHEAD, one of the foremost philosophers of modern science, has said that the mentality of an epoch springs from the view of the world dominant in the educated sections of the community. Each age has had its own preoccupation, but during the last three centuries in Europe the cosmology derived from the physical sciences has been asserting itself at the expense of older points of view which had their origins elsewhere. The findings of science have been truly astounding: so much so that men have almost come to believe that it is the only valid outlook, even that no other is thinkable. Scientists have not been limiting their observations to their own specialities but have been coming out with *obiter dicta* into the fields of culture and morals, æsthetics and philosophy. Their writings together with the practical achievements of science which have revolutionised everyday life, have had the most profound influence on the layman's mentality, even though he may not have stopped to ponder on the scientific outlook and its implications. It would therefore be interesting to attempt a survey of the whole field from the standpoint of the average man. Such a bird's eye view would no doubt be sketchy, but not without its own value. It would help to arrange our thoughts on a subject of the most vital importance, and above all assist in forming an estimate of the value and validity, as well as of the limitations of the scientific method.

---

* Inaugural Address delivered before the Popular Science Association of the Intermediate College, Tumkur, in 1940.

The world-view current today is the outcome of the advance in the physical sciences, although the biological doctrine of evolution has had its own share in shaping it. The science of the mind is only recently entering the arena, and the part it has played has so far been comparatively insignificant. Science in its modern connotation has been a slow, but by no means a steady growth. Its course, like that of true love, has not run smooth. It has had strange ups and downs. Historians of science have usually treated it mainly as a product of the West, whose origins are to be looked for in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean. It used to be considered a typically Greek activity, contrasted with a dread abstraction called Orientalism. The view is however gaining ground that the Greek culture was only a continuation of the older civilizations of Mesopotamia and Egypt. This view itself may have to be revised in the light of the discovery of the Indus valley civilization in the remains at Mohenjo Daro and Harappa which date back at least to the fourth millennium B.C. When the story is fully told, the Nile and the Euphrates may have to give place to the Indus as the mother of science and civilization. That is, however, still a matter of conjecture. Undoubtedly the Babylonians had made great advance in astronomy and mathematics. Their results were taken over by the ancient Egyptians. The Egyptians had developed a very high grade of civilization and an advanced technique. As far back 4236 B.C. they had

State Museum, Lucknow.

introduced a practical calendar. Papyrus manuscripts discovered accidentally during recent years have thrown much light on the extent of their advance in the arts, in astronomy, mathematics and medicine. That Egyptian medicine had reached a high level, free from magical notions and dealing with its subject-matter in a positivistic spirit resembling that of modern science, is revealed by the Edwin Smith payrus which embodies a tradition which is perhaps as old as the fourth millennium B.C. But on the whole, there is no evidence of any attempt to explain all phenomena on the basis of a system of natural law which is the aim of science.

The spirit of pure science, it is claimed, first manifested itself in Greece in the sixth century B.C., and the Greeks were the first people in history to exercise a disinterested curiosity in natural phenomena apart from practical problems. Thales of Miletus was among the earliest enquirers in Europe to ask the question, "Of what and in what way is the world made?" His answer was that water was the first principle of all things. Other philosophers claimed priority for fire, air and earth. Early Greek thought thus recognised four elements, each of which was in turn sought to be made the origin of things. The affinity of these notions to the Hindu doctrine of the five great elements the *panca mahā bhūtas*, will at once be obvious. The Hindu theory was undoubtedly earlier, as also more comprehensive and systematic than the Greek. In all probability the Greeks borrowed from India.

Thales was an Ionian, and it was on the Ionian coast that physical theories closely allied to those of modern

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

science were evolved in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. It was here that Democritus propounded a theory of atoms, which was destined to have a revival after the lapse of many centuries. These theories were however not the result of observation but were based on philosophical speculation. They were on the whole in consonance with the prevalent world-outlook of the day and showed a characteristic tendency towards a combination of the religious, philosophical and scientific standpoints. The work of the Ionian physical philosophers was carried on during the succeeding two or three centuries by the Alexandrian school with which are associated great names like those of Euclid, Archimedes and Ptolemy. The main line of the Greek genius however pursued an altogether different course. Pythagoras and his followers did much for the growth of mathematics, but they combined it with a mystic theory of numbers and the doctrine of reincarnation. Socrates and Plato carried on the Pythagorean tradition. They were concerned more with a world of values rather than of natural phenomena. They were definitely hostile to Ionian science. To them the problems that mattered most were those of ethics and conduct. Plato's *Timaeus* in which he expounds his cosmic theory has been described as "a picture of the depth to which natural science can be degraded by a great mind in its endeavour to give a specific purposive meaning to all parts of the Universe". The schools which grew out of these traditions, *e.g.*, the Epicureans and the Neoplatonists as well as the Stoics of later times were all inimical to the scientific spirit in the secular sense as understood at present, which had to wait for fully 2,000 years before it came into its own.

The Romans who succeeded to the Greek heritage were a matter-of-fact people with no particular aptitude for science. Their attitude appears to have been due not so much to incapacity as to a world-outlook which put practical considerations above the theoretical. Their curiosity did not run away with them, and they did not value mathematics for its own sake. As Cicero said, "The Greeks held the geometer in the highest honour, accordingly nothing made more brilliant progress among them than mathematics. But we have established as the limit of this art its usefulness in measuring and counting." He claims, "the Romans always showed more wisdom than the Greeks in their inventions, or else improved what they borrowed from them, supposing they thought it worthy of serious attention." Apart from their practical interests, the Romans were an essentially religious people. As Polybius wrote, "The Romans were more religious than the gods themselves." So much so, that their mind naturally ran into superstition and they greatly prized arts like astrology and divination. The more sceptical minds of the day like Cicero, and Lucretius, the author of the famous philosophical epic *De Rerum Natura* have recorded their protest against the prevailing superstition.

The Jewish-Christian theology which began about this time to influence the Græco-Roman world, was definitely hostile to science and its growth. The newly converted Christians were eagerly looking forward to the speedy end of the world, in a kind of *mahā praḷaya*, which they called the Lord's Day. To them science and its preoccupation with natural phenomena savoured of impiety. They heartily shared the contempt for Greek science to which St. Paul has given expression in the Epistle to the Galatians, "When ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by *physis* are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn yet again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" Apostolic Fathers like Tertullian were proud of being unphilosophical in their faith. In 390 A.D. Bishop Theophilus destroyed one of the great libraries of Alexandria. In 415 Hypatia, the daughter of Theon the astronomer, and herself a teacher of mathematics, was brutally murdered in Alexandria by a mob of Christian fanatics. Finally the Emperor Justinian had all schools of philosophy closed in 529. It is said that thus the first great period in the history of human thought came to an end, leaving the West to darkness and the Church.

During the five centuries that followed, European science not only did not make any progress, but even went back on its tracks. This period roughly coincided with the spread of Islam. In 641 Alexandria was captured by the Arabs. Arab scholars henceforward took up and carried on the Greek tradition. They borrowed from other sources also, especially Indian. It is interesting to note that the so-called Arabic system of numeral notation, as well as the science of Algebra were originally Hindu inventions which the Arabs appropriated. When the Moors crossed over into Spain, Arab philosophy and science found their way to Europe through Muslim channels.

During the medieval ages not much advance was made in the positive sciences. Mainly on this account, they have been designated the Dark Ages. During this period the philosophic system of Aristotle, and Christian theology dominated men's minds. Like the earth in the Ptolemaic astronomy of the day, man and his destiny were the centre of their universe. Their principal preoccupation was not the betterment of worldly conditions but the salvation of souls. They could not have desired a better spokesman than St. Augustine who said, "I desire to know nothing but God and the soul. Did I say, nothing else? Nothing whatsoever!" They were great ages of belief: and as Goethe has said, "All epochs wherein Belief prevails, under what form it will, are splendid heart-elevating and fruitful. All epochs, on the contrary, when Unbelief, in what form so-ever, maintains its sorry victory, should they even for a moment glitter with a sham splendour, vanish from the eyes of posterity, because no one chooses to burden himself with the study of the unfruitful." We shall never understand the Middle Ages until we realise how profoundly they strove to find a deeper meaning, a sacred significance in all things. "They never forgot" as has been said, "that things would be absurd if their meaning were exhausted in their function and place in the phenomenal world, if by their essence they did not reach into a world beyond this." The medieval man was keenly conscious of the mystery of life, a consciousness which has been overpowered in modern times by the secular spirit of scientific curiosity. Characteristically, the Gnostic philosophy and alchemy had a great vogue in those times. Modern psychological researches, *e.g.*, of C. G. Jung are indicating that these had deep psychological foundations and that alchemy is not merely obsolete chemistry. These subjects will be treated in future with greater respect than hitherto, and not as pseudo-sciences which stood in the way of genuine science.

Considered as chemistry, however, the notions of the alchemists were rather primitive. Their main practical concern was with the transmutation of metals with special reference to the making of gold, and with the elixir of life. They attached great importance to colour and evolved the curious doctrine of three principles according to which sulphur, mercury and salt formed the basis of all matter. Among famous men of this period who may be deemed precursors of modern science, the first place belongs to the Fransiscan friar, Roger Bacon, the father of the modern experimental method. About two and a half centuries later came Leonardo da Vinci, a universal genius whose writings would have inaugurated the revival of modern science towards the close of the fifteenth century had they only been published. But science had still to wait for a century to be born.

Modern science really begins with Copernicus whose work on astronomy was primarily responsible for the general adoption of the view that the earth and other planets move round the sun, in place of the old Ptolemaic geocentric hypothesis. The indirect consequences of the adoption of this theory were even more important than the practical ones. As has been said, "When the earth was once relegated from the position of cosmic centre to that of a minor planet of the sun, it was felt to be impossible to continue to regard man as the crown of creation, or as the hero of the whole cosmic drama; so Church mythology was shaken to its foundations." Naturally the Church banned the book but all in vain. A great revolution was effected whose reverberations are still being felt. Copernicus himself was a rather conservative type of scholar, and not a great observer. The experimental verification of his theory had to wait for Galileo the inventor of the telescope. With his telescope Galileo demonstrated that the planets Mercury and Venus exhibited just those phases as were required by the Copernican theory and that Jupiter with its four moons going round it resembled the sun with circulating planets. To him also belongs the credit of investigating the motions of falling bodies and the vibration of pendulums, thus laying the foundation of dynamics. He too suffered persecution, but nothing more than an honourable detention and a mild reproof, before dying peacefully in bed. The next great advance was made by Kepler who formulated the three laws of planetary motion. It is noteworthy that Kepler was not merely a mathematician and astronomer but also a great mystic and sun-worshipper.

With Newton who was born in 1642, the year in which Galileo died, science attained the age of majority and became fully self-conscious. He combined the mathematical method with experimental checks. His synoptic genius fused into a systematic whole the scattered physical and mathematical knowledge of his time. By his comprehensive formulation of the law of gravitation and his theory of light he inaugurated modern physics. His

Principia will rank among the greatest books of all time. But he does not seem to have realised the limitations of the method he so successfully employed. It was his boast that he did not weave hypotheses. His successors accepted him at his own valuation and for two hundred years to come, science was settled upon a firm basis of dogmatic materialism. Modern developments in physics have however shown the shakiness of the Newtonian position. We now see that notwithstanding his proud claim, he too was weaving hypotheses and not dealing with incontrovertible fact as he imagined. Apart from his science, he was a pious and humble man. He however kept his religion and philosophy in water-tight compartments like so many others and resented the intrusion of metaphysics into the region of science, with the result that the dominant interest prospered at the expense of appreciation of the wholeness of life and the unity of experience.

A little earlier, Robert Boyle whose name is familiarly associated with the famous law relating to the pressure exerted by gases, had questioned the alchemical classification of substances in his book, *The Sceptical Chymist*. He made the first rational beginning in chemistry by introducing the cardinal distinction between elements and compounds. He also made experiments regarding the nature of combustion, and attacked the old phlogiston theory. The subject was further investigated by Priestly and Cavendish and its true nature finally explained by the brilliant French experimenter, Lavoisier, who established the law of the conservation of matter. He was executed by the leaders of the French Revolution, a

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

warning that fanaticism is not the monopoly of religion. It is related of this great man that he asked for a short respite before his execution to enable him to complete and record the results of an experiment he had begun! A little later the atomic theory was enunciated by John Dalton, a Manchester schoolmaster. The theory itself was as old as the Greeks, but he gave it a quantitative and fruitful form. The work thus started made rapid progress during the nineteenth century. The first synthesis of organic compounds in the laboratory was made by Wohler in 1828, emulating nature's own processes; and Mendeleef discovered the law of periodicity of the elements. The spectacular advances made in chemistry have pervaded every walk of modern life and industry. Their influence on men's outlook however has been minor as compared with those of recent developments in physics and biology.

We may now take a look backwards at the natural sciences. Greek biology and physiology were closely bound up with the practice of medicine which goes back to Hippocrates in the fifth century B.C. The Greeks explained physiological functioning by the doctrine of humours which survives in language even today when we speak of the sanguine, bilious and choleric temperaments. It would appear as if the idea was suggested to the Greeks by the Indian doctrine of the *tridoṣas* which had been systematised in the Ayurveda at a much earlier date. The Hippocratic tradition was greatly advanced by Aristotle who was the son of the court physician to Philip of Macedon, the father of Alexander the Great. Aristotle was not only a great classifier but also an original observer, having dissected no less than fifty types himself. He has left several works on the subject which have elicited admiration from no less an authority than Darwin. The next great name in medicine and physiology is that of Galen, physician to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. It was he that initiated experimental physiology and his works remained authorities on the subject for centuries to come. No further advance was made till the sixteenth century when the Belgian anatomist Vesalius insisted on a fresh scrutiny of the facts, and a little later William Harvey demonstrated the circulation of blood. In the eighteenth century monumental work in botany and biology was done by Linnæus "the father of botany", and Cuvier. Before we go on to the nineteenth century we may pause to have a glance at geology, one of the latest comers into the field of science. It was only towards the close of the eighteenth century that James Hutton published his theory that the different strata of the earth were due to orderly deposits over long periods of time. William Smith subsequently studied the distribution of fossils through the various geological layers, a work which was of great consequence in the development of the theory of evolution. The geological knowledge of the day was brought together and systematised by Lyell in the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* burst like a bombshell over mankind in 1859. Perhaps no single book in the whole history of human thought has caused a comparable revolution in men's outlook or given rise to more bitter controversy. His thesis that species are not immutable but have come into being by gradual modification, and that man is descended from the lower animals has now become a truism of science. The whole process is called evolution, a theory whose sweep is comparable to that of Newton's law of gravitation. Darwin accounted for the process by his theory of Natural Selection, according to which there is a continuous struggle for existence in the animal kingdom, which leads to the natural selection of those qualities that are most useful to preserve and continue the life of the species. Darwin illustrated his theory by a remarkable wealth of facts gleaned during the course of a lifetime. It has been said that mounted on the back of Natural Selection, Evolution attacked and conquered the nineteenth century world. Its merit in the eyes of its supporters was that it was a great feat of rationalisation, substituting in place of the myth of special creation a mechanical and almost mindless process denying that the purposive striving of the organism has any influence on its evolution, and thus bringing biology into line with the physical sciences. A minority however contended with Lamarck that the modification of species depended on intrinsic reasons, and that the effects of personal and individual effort are transmitted to the offspring. Lamarck stressed the mental aspect of life, and wanted due recognition for the share that an insurgent, wilful, struggling organism full of need or *besoin* must have in its own evolution. But this was dubbed rank heresy by the orthodox Darwinians and for two generations it became almost impossible for a biologist to maintain this rather obvious proposition without suffering professional ostracism.

The tide, however, seems to have turned and the doctrine is being revived today by a number of prominent biologists, like Prof. Mac Bride, who admit that there is now abundant experimental evidence for the effect of acquired habits on the next generation.

It is interesting to note the effect of the Darwinian literature on the common man. For a long time the catchwords "the struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest" captured the popular imagination and theories of conduct and society were based upon them. It is only of late that it is being recognised that fitness for survival may be quite other than fitness in human value, and that the two may even be antithetical.

Apart from the evolutionary hypothesis, other great researches were made in biology, *e.g.*, the discovery of micro-organisms by Pasteur and of the laws of heredity by Mendel, not to mention a host of others. The nineteenth century was indeed a halcyon epoch for the all-round development of science. A novel future for physics was envisaged about the beginning of the century by the invention of non-Euclidean geometries by Lobachevsky, a Russian, and Bolyai, a Hungarian. Their stand point was so unusual that even the mathematicians of the time thought they were mad, and the great Gauss who had reached similar conclusions independently had been afraid to publish them. It was one such geometry, that of Riemann, which Einstein used to arrive at his famous Theory of Relativity. The development of photography and the invention of the spectroscope led to sensational revelations regarding the nature and constitution of the celestial bodies. Much of the accepted knowledge regarding the stars rests on such a slender foundation that it would be upset by even a slight change in the interpretation of the position of spectrum lines, and could well be dubbed "spectres raised by the spectroscope". A new science of electricity and magnetism has grown up which has practically made a new world for us. The pioneers in this field were Faraday, Maxwell, Hertz the discoverer of electrical waves, and others too numerous to name. Towards the close of the century, science stood on its achievement, robust and self-confident in its materialism. The scientific method stood alone and without a rival. One of its foremost apostles, Huxley, proclaimed "I come to forward the application of scientific methods of investigation to all the problems of life." For him, Faith was "the one unpardonable sin", yet he pinned his own faith to the scientific method, and for him science was nothing but "organised common sense".

Yet at the very time that this prophet was declaiming from the house-tops, and substituting the mythology of evolution and the "struggle for existence" for the mythology of the Bible, a new spirit was in the air which was soon to shake science to its foundations and bring about a new humility. That was the beginning of an end which we have yet to see. A number of causes contributed to this. Experiments showed that the old hard atom of matter could be broken up into still smaller units called electrons. It was disclosed that these were really not particles and that their whole mass was due to the electric charges they bore. This broke the back of the old fundamental notion of "substance". Then Rutherford showed that an atom was really like a miniature solar system with electrons revolving round a nucleus. Striking experimental evidence for this was found in the behaviour of radium and the rays emitted by it. It was calculated that the energy contained in a thimbleful of mud, if only it could be made available by the annihilation of the atoms contained in it, would be sufficient to drive a large ship across the Atlantic, and that if all the atoms in a man's body were so condensed as to leave no space unfilled, the man's body would become a barely visible speck. All this was very far indeed from Huxley's organised commonsense. But the matter was not left to rest there.

While on the one hand the atomic structure of matter and the notion of mass itself were being denied, other researches showed that energy had a sort of atomic structure. Except on this hypothesis the results of Max Planck's experiments made about the year 1900 on radiant heat could not be assimilated. He came to the conclusion that heat was radiated by a body or absorbed by another not continuously but in small packets or quanta. Unexpected confirmation of this theory came independently from Einstein. These ideas effected a great revolution in thought, being diametrically opposed to our conceptions regarding the continuity of such things as space and energy. At present it looks as if this tendency towards atomisation is likely to spread.

Another fundamental breakdown in physics was the myth of ether which had been brought into being in order to explain the propagation of light mechanically. All kinds of contradictory properties were attributed to

LUCKNOW.

it until it broke down at last under the weight of the functions it was called upon to discharge. It was Einstein who showed that there was no reason at all to suppose that an ether existed. Earlier, the famous Michelson-Morley experiment first conducted in 1887 and repeated with modifications by various observers had yielded paradoxical results regarding the question as to whether the ether travelled with the earth in its motion through space. In 1905 Einstein published his first Theory of Relativity, and propounded the extraordinary conclusion that the velocity of light was the same however measured, whether from a system in motion or a system at rest, being a sort of "critical velocity" which could under no circumstances be exceeded. This was shown to be due to the fact that measures of length as well as time varied with the degree of motion. This led to some astounding results. Thus events which are simultaneous for one observer are not simultaneous for another observer moving with a different motion. There is no such thing as *the* time or *the* distance between two events.

Time and Space as separate entities which formed the basis of Newtonian physics were thus abolished at one stroke, and a four-dimensional continuum called space-time substituted, in which the relation between events was described as an *interval*. As Minkowski announced in his famous Address, "Henceforth time by itself and space by itself are doomed to fade away into mere shadows, and only a kind of union of the two will preserve an independent reality." Abundant experimental evidence has been forthcoming in support of the new standpoint. It is not possible to refer here to the later advances based on electromagnetic and other investigations with which are associated great names like those of Raman, Weyl, Eddington, Nils Bohr and others. There is considerable lack of agreement between their conclusions and it has even been said that choice between them is a matter of taste! One important development however of the Quantum Theory has to be mentioned. That is the Principle of Indeterminacy which is based on the realisation of the fact that we cannot observe nature without disturbing it. This principle gives the go-by to the strict determinism which has formed the back-bone of official science hitherto, and makes possible the introduction of something faintly resembling our own experience of free-will. The so-called laws of nature are thus deposed from their pontifical position of inevitability, and the apparent uniformity of nature is seen to be either merely a statistical effect, or the result of a geometry which we have ourselves imposed on phenomena.

It is truly a wonderful picture of the universe that science has given to us. On the one hand, are the astronomical distances in space, the farthest visible bodies being separated from us by a hundred million light years, a light-year being the distance travelled by light in one year at the rate of 1,86,000 miles a second! No less than two million stars are visible to us, including the galaxies each one of which is itself an island universe. Science tells us this vast universe must have had a beginning at some remote point of time. Withal, according to Einstein and his followers space is finite and bounded, and yet continually expanding. It reminds one of the Hindu idea of the cosmos as *Brahmāṇḍa* or the egg of *Brahma*, and of the meaning of the root *Bṛh* which indicates growth and expansion. On the other hand, science takes us into the region of the infinitely minute, the world of electrons which comprise miniature solar systems in themselves, and the world of ultra-microscopic life like that of the filter-passing viruses. What finer and more compact description of this whole could we desire than the *aṇoraṇīyān mahato mahīyān* of the *Upaniṣads*? A new scientific mysticism seems to be growing up under our very eyes, associated with the names of Einstein, Eddington, Jeans and others, for whom the stuff of the world is comparable to mind-stuff. Other concepts of a non-mechanical nature have been offered to us from the fields of biology and psychology to account for the whole range of phenomena in a satisfactory manner, *e.g.*, the Life-force of the vitalists, the *elan vital* of Bergson, the Cosmic Unconscious of Broad, and the *libido* of the psycho-analysts.

But it would be a mistake to imagine that these views have gained acceptance in the orthodox scientific fold. The old mechanistic materialism is still apparently holding the citadel. Its view-point can best be expressed in the words of Earl Russell, "That man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all the labours of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noon-day brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and the whole temple of man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a Universe in ruins—all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet nearly so certain that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand." He reaches the conclusion, "Only on the firm foundation of unyielding despair can the soul's habitation henceforth be safely built!" Here is a pessimism blacker than that which Westerners have been attributing to the Orient. If this is all that Science has to offer to us, we seem to be on the verge of entering a new Dark Age, compared to which the Cimmerian darkness would be light!

There is however no call for such pessimism. That is what comes of taking scientific hypotheses too seriously and forgetting their function. In their essence they are useful myths and not descriptions of reality. Their justification is that they help in correlating certain experimental and mathematical results. But such success is no criterion of truth. The path of science is strewn with the wrecks of exploded hypotheses. Phlogiston and ether have had their day and been relegated to oblivion. Even the concepts of space and time and mass and energy are in the melting pot. It is common knowledge that successful empirical results can be derived from mistaken hypotheses. As the great psychologist Jung has said, "Columbus, by using subjective assumptions, a false hypothesis and a route abandoned by modern navigation, nevertheless discovered America." A little consideration will show that the scientific method is partial and is based on the assumption that only the mathematical properties are real because they can be measured, all the rest being ignored. But such abstraction can never take the place of immediate experience. The findings of science consist mainly of what Eddington has well termed "pointer readings"; and they can no more speak for the whole of human experience than a telephone number can be substituted for a subscriber. There is no *a priori* inevitability about mathematics itself even in its own field. The advent of non-Euclidean geometries has demonstrated that it is possible to start with almost any axioms and postulates and evolve a consistent network of reasoning.

Science is really a closed system explaining its concepts in terms of one another. It is as if one should define a violoncello as a big violin and a violin as a small violoncello. An examination of the famous doctrine of the conservation of energy will make this clear. When a body is lifted up to a height, it is explained that it acquires potential energy and that the sum of the kinetic and potential energies is constant. But it will at once be perceived that "potential energy" does not correspond to anything in actuality, but is a term invented for the express purpose of saving the face of the theory. It is like book-keeping by the method of "double entry" where convention requires that every item should find a place on the debit as well as credit side of the ledger. At best, science gives a working knowledge of certain kinds of structure, but none whatever of reality. To give a comparison, scientific knowledge is to reality, what a formula combining the tensions of the fiddle strings and the wave-lengths of the musical notes is to the music itself. The two are on altogether different planes.

Besides it has to be remembered that it is only a fraction of man's mind, "the Euclidean understanding" that is brought to bear on scientific problems. As William James held, "the Euclidean understanding" makes human experience not more but less intelligible. A recent writer is at great pains to emphasise the functioning of the mind as a whole. He says, "But what is meant here by mind? Not the intellect taken by itself, 'the Euclidean understanding', but those faculties in us of which the Self is the sole possessor. Let us recollect that the intellect is not the deepest thing in us, and the soul does more than think. It feels, desires and wills. The soul or 'I' is something for itself, a quintessence of primordial being beyond analysis, deeper sunk in reality than the intelligence or understanding, which within itself it brings to birth."

Again even in the application of this limited understanding, the scientific method has been full of tacit assumptions and deepset prejudices. We have already referred to its mathematical bias. But there is something more insidious than this. It has been actuated by the desire to keep out at all costs whatever looks like purpose or design, from its scheme. This has been especially the case with the natural sciences, which have been only too anxious to emulate the methods of the physical sciences, much to their own disadvantage. It is said of T. H. Huxley that he opposed the theory of evolution so long as mind and effort were held to be the dynamic of evolutionary variation, but became an enthusiastic convert when Charles Darwin substituted chance and accident in their place. To him as to many others the supreme attraction of Darwinism lay in its exclusion of special creation, and the idea of purpose. It was agreed in advance that the doctrine must be true and there followed a sustained effort to prove it true. Never has greater zeal and industry been displayed than in the search of corroborative evidence. Even today that is the attitude of the orthodox man of science. "The aim of modern physiology", says Hoffding, "is to conceive all organic processes as physical or chemical." No wonder the results have been made to match. But as Kant has said, "It is very absured to expect enlightenment from reason and yet to dictate to her in advance upon which side she must necessarily determine." The *Bhagavad Gītā* has put it even more profoundly: *Ye yathā mām prapadyante tāms tathaiva bhajāmyaham*: Reality appears to a seeker in whatever form he desires to see it. Scientists started with the "inertia" of Newton's first law of motion—*tamas*—and reached a *tāmasic* description of the universe.

This is not to cry down science but only to show its limitations and temper its airs of omniscience. It has undoubtedly been a magnificent adventure of the human spirit and has enlarged man's vision and given him a new idea of freedom of thought. It has shown to what heights he can rise even by using only a part of his faculties. Science is not alien to man's nature. As Jung says, "It is out of himself and out of his peculiar constitution that man has produced his sciences. They are symptoms of his psyche." But the fact remains that the scientific man is not a complete man. He has deliberately left out of his scheme wholeness, individuality and purpose, and has paid dearly for all his achievements without being aware of it. Scientists have developed an orthodoxy of their own, succumbing to the common infirmity of the vast majority of men to economise thought by a series of arrests. Science has acquired a dogmatism born of success, and a hostility to ideas which do not fall within the scope of the accepted methodology. Today, more than at any previous time in history, is it necessary to heed Dr. Whitehead's warning, "Some of the major disasters of mankind have been produced by the narrowness of men with a good methodology."

We have seen the comparative failure of mechanical hypotheses in biology. This has been even greater in the field of psychology. For this reason, psychology has been completely left out of our survey. It is still in the stage in which biology was in the time of Aristotle. No doubt modern psychology has to its credit some noteworthy discoveries, *e.g.*, the function and importance of the subconscious mind. But these point only to the great findings of ancient philosophy and religion: that the only direction in which to look for reality is inside of oneself. Reality is first psychological and then everything else. If therefore psychology is to make any advance at all, it must start with the Self. But science including psychology, has hitherto made the not-Self its only preoccupation. The Self or anything concerned with it has been its *bete noir*, and has been contemptuously discarded as mysticism. But "the only existent which includes all other existents is consciousness, the appanage of the Self: and apart from the self, the centre of everything, there is neither consciousness nor thinking, neither desiring nor explaining, neither science nor logic, neither knowing nor being known. The attempt to derive the self from atoms and the void, from space and time, to deny it any constructive role in the system of nature has not failed for lack of unceasing and desperate effort. It has failed because you cannot explain the self in terms of the not-self." This is not an extract from the *Upaniṣads* but from a recent Gifford lecturer (W. MacNeile Dixon—*The Human Situation*). He goes on, "The philosophies of the future will, I think, take another and more promising way. They will allow the self its unique status, its standing as a factor, a primary factor and an organising factor in the universal whole. They will reinstate personality in its true place in the universe, and leave room for its expansion." After all, a step seems to be taken in the right direction. Thus alone can the *Adhyātma Vidyā*, the Science of sciences be reached, or rather recovered.

LANGUAGE—ITS SCOPE AND FUNCTION *

You have done me the unique honour of inviting me to deliver the Inaugural Address of this Association for the second time in the course of a few years. I am painfully aware that my knowledge of the Sanskrit language is not of a sufficiently high order to justify your choice. My position is well expressed by the *Upaniṣadic* sentence—*nāham manye suvedeti, no na vedeti veda ca*—I can certainly not say that I know it well, nor yet that I do not know it. Such as it is, I shall place it before you. My theme is the scope and function of language in general and of the Sanskrit language in particular. My outlook on the topic is, I am afraid, rather unusual. The conclusions are quite orthodox by Hindu standards. But the Pandits may find fault with my mode of approach which is coloured by the findings of science. On the other hand, science will be angry with me for the unauthorised use made of its results. Thus my stand which partakes of the character of a half-way house between orthodoxy and science, runs the risk of being disowned by both, the one rejecting it as new-fangled stuff, and the other brushing it aside as out-of-date medievalism. But I am running the risk with open eyes for the sake of presenting an aspect of the subject somewhat outside the routine, yet of the most fascinating interest.

There are some things which are so close to us that on this very account we are likely to lose sight of their importance and mystery. One such is undoubtedly language. Our acquaintance with it is bound up with the earliest years of life, and is almost instinctive. It is rarely made the subject of thought at least by the majority of users of language, comprising the whole human race. Even philosophers have mostly given it the go-by, taking it as granted and understood. Yet nothing could be farther from the fact. The full significance of this has only lately began to be realised: to what an extent our philosophy and psychology, and even experience itself are conditioned by the use of language. Where we seem to be on the firmest earth, we are treading on something live and dynamic. In the words of Sir James Frazer, "Only those whose studies have led them to investigate the subject are aware of the depth to which the ground under our feet is thus, as it were, honeycombed by unseen forces."

---

* Inaugural Address delivered before the Sanskrit Association of the Maharaja's College, Mysore, in 1942.

Language has long been considered to be man's special prerogative, and what mainly distinguishes him from the lower animals. And so it is, if by language we mean articulate speech. But recent investigations have shown that although the lower animals have no true language, yet there are grounds for believing that they do communicate with each other to a limited extent by means of sounds and gestures. Thus the apes, who are nearest to man, are said to use a rich and varied vocabulary of sounds for purposes of communication. With these they express their feelings and needs, but they cannot describe objects. No ape has any word for things, nor can it be taught language habits. It is thus clear that some means of communication are common to man and the lower animals, for man's own communications with his fellow-beings are not wholly restricted to articulate speech. The difference, although it is undoubtedly very marked, appears to be one of degree rather than of kind. This gives us an insight into the profound statement of *Ṛgveda* that Speech is multiform and that even the animals make use of it—*tām viśvarūpāḥ paśavo vadanti*.

Anyhow, the spoken word was a formidable tool which made possible the phenomenal expansion of man's mental life. Just as the tool is an extension of the hand, the word was an extension of the mind. In the striking words of Wells, "Language is the hand of the mind to hold and keep." But it is really something more than that. The hand for all its importance, has after all only a limited function in man's life. The function of man's mind is however all-pervasive. As G. H. Lewes has written in his *Life of Goethe*, "The whole man thinks." We may add similarly that the whole man feels, for feeling and thinking are integral. Likewise, the whole man expresses. Expression and mind have thus gone on mutually augmenting each other. As the eminent anthropologist Dr. Marrett has said "The differentia of man, the quality that marks him off from the other animals, is undoubtedly his power of articulate speech. If language is ultimately the creation of the intellect, yet hardly less fundamentally is the intellect a creation of language." Once again, this is but a rediscovery of a fundamental truth to which the *Veda* gave utterance millenniums ago—*vāngme manasi pratiṣṭhitā, mano me vāci pratiṣṭhitam*: Speech and mind are centred in each other, and interact for the revelation of the spirit.

The origins of language, like the origin of man himself, are shrouded in obscurity. As between the ape and man, so between their modes of expression, there appears to have been a missing link which has not been discovered. Some authorities like Wundt have held that the search for origins is itself based on the fallacy that man was without speech at some time, for which there is no evidence. Others believe that speech had its origin in primitive man's necessities like food-getting and the instinct for self-protection. Some, including such great names in the field of linguistics as Jespersen, contend that it had its root in man's superfluous activity after his animal needs were satisfied and that it is closely akin to play and song, to art and poetry and courtship. The truth as usual appears to lie somewhere midway between the several hypotheses.

Whatever the origin of speech, it has in the course of the ages divided itself into innumerable languages and dialects—those which survive as well as those which have been lost. For long, the possessors of each language thought with pride that theirs was an autonomous activity and the only original and divine language. This narrow attitude appears to have been so widespread that it led the great Goethe to protest, "Who knows but his own language, knows none." The discovery of Sanskrit by the West about the beginning of the nineteenth century initiated the scientific study of languages in Europe. Before long, comparative philology became the fashion in many Continental universities. It was a great eye-opener which showed the affinity between the several languages of the Indo-Aryan group. In their first enthusiasm, scholars laid aside parochial patriotisms and hailed Sanskrit as the mother of the Indo-Aryan group of languages. But very soon, conservatism and the deep-rooted feeling about the inherent superiority of the Western races asserted themselves, and Sanskrit was deposed to a humbler place, *viz.*, that of the eldest among the sister languages. Philology also ran into side-lines and excesses and the philological approach came to be associated with fanciful and arbitrary speculations and even became a word of reproach.

In the meantime, the study of language was being approached from another angle by the anthropologists who accepted the newly formulated doctrine of evolution on Darwinian lines. They examined the languages of primitive people through evolutionary spectacles and drew their own conclusions. It was at once obvious that language had been subject to its own course of evolution. They were not slow to recognise that language was undoubtedly the most important among all the instruments of civilization. But they found that by their standards, language was a very unprogressive instrument, and that the power of words was the most conservative force in the history of life. As one of these investigators has put it, "Tens of thousands of years have elapsed since we shed our tails, but we are still communicating with a medium developed to meet the needs of arboreal man." The modern world is certainly very different from that of primitive man and social life has reached a stage of unprecedented elaboration. It is therefore being urged, and with great plausibility, that language should fall in line and keep pace with it. Language should also be made

State Museum, LUCKNOW.

to shed its tail, as it has failed to do so voluntarily. This plea is receiving support from the analogy of the sciences whose phenomenal growth has led to the ingression into language of a host of new words under the insistent demands of practice and theory. Armed with these vocabularies and novel techniques, science has invaded fresh fields, one amongst which is that of language. No doubt, the phonetic and grammatical aspects of language had been considered from very early times. But the study of language with special reference to meaning and significance, of language as the vehicle of thought is only recently coming into prominence under the name of Semantics. Among the pioneers connected with this new form of analysis have to me mentioned the names of Ogden, Richards and many others. A branch of the new science, applied semantics, is attempting to tackle practical questions like language reform, and what is known as Basic English is one of its first outcomes. Semantics is opening up a very rich and interesting field of study and the highest hopes are being entertained by its exponents regarding its future. It is expected to bring about nothing short of a revolution in thought. Thus Prof. Pear says, "If the discovery of the psychological nature of meaning were completely successful, it might put an end to psychology altogether." In the face of such arresting claims we may well pause to see how far they are justifiable.

Semantics has set out with the purpose of raising the level of communication through a direct study of its conditions, its dangers and its difficulties. In a manner of speaking, it has been concerning itself with the seamy side of language. It has been deeply impressed by Bentham's statement that "Error is never so difficult to be destroyed as when it has its root in language." The illusions created by language are not restricted to the ignorant and the uneducated. It is being more and more realized to what an extent even men of learning and sincerity are at the mercy of forms of speech. Most philosophy and metaphysics are illustrations of this. As Mr. H. G. Wells has said, "The whole of Western thought has been misled by the words *principle* and *quality*." As against this verbomania, semantics wants to substitute a scientific approach. It is convinced that every gain in science was acquired at the expense of some generally accepted piece of metaphysics. It traces the whole trouble to the naive belief that words always correspond in some way to things, an attitude which semantics condemns as "primitive superstition" and "word magic". On the other hand, the semantic analysis attempts to show that there is no necessary or unique relation between words and things. Between the two intervenes thought which is causally related to each of these. In one new terminology a "thing" is designated as *referent*, with a view to avoid the popular association of the word with material objects. A "word" is termed a *symbol*, and "thought" which comes in between is called *reference*. The semantic contention is that symbol and reference are not directly related to each other, but only through "reference". It is conceded that "reference" is essentially an intellectual process and that the language has other functions. These are however given only a subsidiary place and grouped together under the term Emotive. Such in brief is the semantic position.

It is open to the obvious criticism that it tries to introduce into the psychological field the assumptions and methods of mathematics and the physical sciences. But it is now being admitted by the physicists themselves that their methods have a limited application within their own sphere. According to Dr. Whitehead, the progress of biology and psychology has been checked by the uncritical assumption of such half-truths. Language and psychology are bound up together and any consideration of the former without reference to the latter is not only foredoomed to failure but may even cause great harm. If we are to inoculate ourselves against verbomania, it is first of all necessary, in the words of Goldberg, to understand that "the real trouble lies not in the words but in the psychology behind the words. The word is but a symptom, a symbol, a sign pointing not only to an object or a concept but to a subject and a conceiver." The tendency to treat words as if they were realities has not been the monopoly of metaphysics, but has affected science also all along. Even a glance at the history of words like Matter and Force, Ether, Energy and Evolution is sufficient to show this. For example, examination of the catch-phrase "the survival of the fittest" will make it clear to what extent it has influenced the course of biology. Yet it embodies a verbal fallacy confusing two distinct meanings of the word "fit". If fit means merely fit to survive, the phrase only suggests that those who survive, do actually survive, which is tautologous. If however "fitness" is any indication of value, it is at once obvious that it can have no place whatever in the scientific hypothesis of evolution, and that fitness for biological survival be quite other than fitness meaning deserving to survive. Yet the greatest pains have been devoted to collect evidence in support of the hypothesis whose truth has been accepted as an axiom by most biologists, without even an inkling of the ambiguity on which it rests.

Semantics is showing symptoms of the very disease it seeks to cure, when it hopes to solve the problem of meaning by paraphrasing ordinary language into technical terms like reference and referent. After stressing that words are not things, it looks as if it has succumbed to the temptation of dealing with words as if they were things, hard and static. The reason for this is its preoccupation with the written word which has a specious appearance of stability. But the central problem of language is the spoken word which is fluid like music and cannot be torn from its concrete context. The meaning of words cannot be decided from on high on *a priori* grounds. Any attempt to do so on the abstract criteria of conceptual thought is sure to miss the mark. Such thought resembles a mathematical equation from which we get back only what we ourselves have put into it. Mathematics is itself a language devised by human ingenuity for dealing with external nature. It is not the only possible language. The efforts of semantics to reform language on the model of the languages of science and mathematics will drain it of all emotional vitality and creative potency. The sphere of real language is the human psyche. Creative imagination has had more to do with its growth than the intellect. As a great psychologist has put it, speech is a storehouse of images founded on experience. It is as much rooted in the unconscious, both individual and racial, as in the conscious. The poet and artist and seer are more at home in it than the expert. The poet has been very aptly called the word-maker, for all growth in language is in the nature of a voicing forth—an evocation. It is also something inspired and sacred—an invocation. It is intimately connected with the central life-processes. As Mr. Basil de Selincourt writes, "It is because language is a branch of the tree of life that we can do little either by way of influencing or predicting its future."

For language, the psychic sphere is the region of reality. In this region reign the primordial images and symbols which condition all real thinking. If it should be objected that this is primitive superstition and word-magic, one might reply in the words of Jung, "By what criterion should we judge something to be an illusion? Does there exist for the psyche anything which we may call illusion? What we are pleased to call such may be for the psyche a most important factor of life—something as indispensable as oxygen for the organism—a psychic actuality of prime importance. Presumably the psyche does not trouble about our categories of reality, and it would be therefore the better part of wisdom for us to say: everything that *acts* is actual." It thus looks as if for the psyche a word may be or rather *is* a thing. Except on this supposition, neither experience nor expression can be adequately dealt with. There may after all be something in the naive outlook which is fundamental, and which refuses to be exorcised by the semantic "word-magic" of calling it "primitive superstition". To use Hindu terminology, a referent may be of a *sūkṣma* or psychic nature. In failing to recognize this, semantics is limiting the validity of its analysis to language whose sole function is the description of physical reality—the *sthūla*. Parodying the words of Shakespeare we may well say, "There are more referents in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your semantics!" The Hindu scheme shows a better appreciation of the realities of the situation when it calls the thing or object *padārtha*: that which is signified by the *pada*, the word or name, literally a step or stage. *Pada*—the word—is a step to meaning—*artha*—which is itself a referent of a psychic order. In the ultimate analysis, a referent is not other than meaning, for we are immediately aware only of occurrences in the psyche, and even what is called matter is but an inference from these. That is why we have had no hesitation in placing the *sūkṣma* before the *sthūla*. In giving priority to the physical over the psychic, semantics is putting the cart before the horse, and showing how tacitly it has adopted the assumptions of physical science.

Enough has been said to suggest that the phenomena of language have a spiritual basis, and that the attitude of antiquity towards them was more profound than the secular and sterilised attitude of modern semantics. Poets and sensitive men of all ages have been keenly aware of this. Thus Walt Whitman exclaims, "All words are spiritual; nothing is more spiritual than words. Whence are they? Along how many thousands and tens of thousands of years have they come?" Even a brief glance backwards shows that for centuries the greater part of mankind believed that the name was sacred and that it was integrally connected with the soul, so much so that it could be substituted for it. We find from the Pyramid texts that the ancient Egyptians worshipped a god called Khern, *i.e.*, Word: the Word having a personality like that of a man. They held that Creation was due to the interpretation in words by Thoth of the will of the Supreme Deity. Man was believed to have several souls, of which the most important was the eighth, the Name-soul, and they took great pains to prevent its extinction, and ensure its continuation along with the names of the gods.

The ancient Greeks were a people very sensitive to subtle influences, and their outlook was permeated through and through by a recognition of the spirituality of language. Herakleitos, one of their oldest and most famous philosophers, held that words embodied the nature of things. He saw in language the most constant thing in a world of ceaseless change, an expression of that common wisdom which is in all men. For him the structure of human speech reflects the structure of the world. It is an embodiment of that structure—"The *Logos* is contained in it as one meaning may be contained in many outwardly different symbols. These views were transmitted through the Pythagorean tradition and greatly influenced Plato. But they were not restricted to philosophers alone. Herodotus and Thucydides, the great Greek historians, bear witness to their all-pervasiveness. Herodotus himself refuses to mention the name of Osiris. It is recorded that after the Pelopponesan War the Greeks felt that the verbal machinery had gone out of gear and they were powerless to cope with such a situation. As Thucydides says, "The meaning of words had no longer the same relation to things but was changed by men as they thought proper". Aeschylus and Sophocles were also believers in the magic power of words.

Plato developed the Herakleitian view of language. His theory of Ideas is nothing more than a doctrine of name-souls, and his Ideal World is where these name-souls dwell. Aristotle too had an extraordinary reverence for words, and even in his logic he is absolutely dependent on the structure of his mother-tongue. As Mauthner has said, "If Aristotle had spoken Chinese or Dacotan, he would have had to adopt an entirely different Logic, or at any rate an entirely different theory of categories". We can only barely refer to another concept which was to influence religious and philosophical thought for centuries to come, *viz*., the doctrine of the *Logos* which was mentioned in connection with Herakleitos. The word is derived from the verb *legein*, to speak or say. *Logos* is primarily "What is said", utterance or speech. It soon acquired another meaning "significance" or "reason". This was greatly developed by the Neo-Platonists and later on taken up by the Stoics, for whom it became *Logos Spermatikos*, the seminal word, or the germinal reason. Christianity also came under the spell of the doctrine.

But the idea of the potency of the name is already to be found in the Old Testament. As Rowell has put it, "The story of creation in the Genesis illustrates with extraordinary vividness the close link between creation and naming, between the thing and the word. Each act of creation is ratified by the giving of a name, and name follows the thing created with an immediacy which almost makes of two acts one; the sequence is reiterated with an accent so strongly marked as to approach the force of necessity. 'And God said: Let there be light: and there was light. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night' and so on. Each thing as it emerges from the surrounding void is, as it were, seized and held fast in place by its name and in and by a name it gains self-possession and articulateness." When we come to the New Testament we find the doctrine of the *Logos* already full-fledged in the fourth Gospel, *Logos* being translated into English as the Word: "In the beginning was the Word. The Word was with God. The Word was God". It is unnecessary for our purpose to pursue further the influence of this doctrine on Christianity. A good instance of the popular belief in the intimate connection between words and reality is, however, to be found in the Christian conception of blasphemy: God is supposed to be personally offended by the desecration of His Name. It was considered so grave an offence that even as late as the time of Henry VIII a boy was put to death by burning in England for repeating some idle words which he had chanced to hear respecting the sacrament. It is perhaps as a reaction against former excesses in this direction that the new semantists are so anxious to sterilise the word of its power, for they have suffered from it so much. But it is a mistake to suppose that the radiant no longer exists because it has a shadow side. In the anxiety to get rid of the evil, it looks as if they do not mind losing the good, throwing out the baby also with the old bath-tub.

It is now high time for us to return home after our sojourn in foreign countries. We have already referred to the profound intimations in the *Ṛgveda* regarding the origin and function of speech. Some more illustrations will be of interest. There is the *Sūkta* which begins *aham rudrebhir*, popularly known as the *Devī Sūkta* in which Speech personified lauds herself as the support and substratum of all the gods. Another good example is the famous *Sūkta* commencing—*Bṛhaspate prathamam vāco*, full of mystic import. It says, the wise reached the path of Speech by sacrifice. When the sages created Speech through wisdom, it was like an act of winnowing barley with a sieve. The *Ṛṣis* first acquired it and dispersed it in many places. It was essentially an act of naming. The best part of speech is secret and only revealed through affection and sympathy. Thus, "One man, indeed, seeing Speech has not seen her; another hearing her has not heard her, but to another she delivers her person as a loving wife well-attired presents herself to her husband. One man firmly established in the friendship (of Speech) becomes wise and powerful, but another wanders with an illusion that is barren, bearing Speech that is without fruit and without flower"—*aphalām apuṣpām*. The philosophic and symbolic interpretations of these utterances are to be found in the *Āraṇyakas* and *Upaniṣads*. The god *Agni* of the *Veda* is here identified with the faculty of speech, which is again described under various symbols, as food, as life, mind, etc. The intimate connection between speech and mind is emphasised and finally the whole universe of experience is depicted as consisting of *nāma* and *rūpa*, the name and the form (of perception). As the *Chāndōgya* says, the whole relative world of effects owes its very existence to speech: just as all pots and other earthen vessels are only modifications of clay, so is this vast universe nothing but an elaboration of speech—*vācārambhaṇam*.

Gathering up the scattered threads of our thought, we may say that the time-honoured view of the function of speech was based on a perception of the live nexus between speech and mind. Speech was something evolved out of the mind, but which remained as part of it, as its support and backbone. In Hindu terminology mind—*manas*—was protected—*trāyate* or borne up by it. It was *mantra*. This conception has come down along the ages in almost unbroken continuity. Its use as such was embodied in the cultus or sacrifice: *Yajña*, which enshrined a unique attitude towards the universe. By the universe is meant here not so much the world of physical fact, but rather of what we called *sūkṣma* or psychic reality. This was the region of personality or *adhidaiva*, as distinguished from the other which was called *adhibhūta*. As the *Gīta* says—*puruṣaśca adhidaivatam*. Contrasted with the variety and discreteness of the physical world, the psychic world was the experience of unity in variety. It was in the region of the embodied personality that *Yajña* was effective: *adhiyajñoham evātra dehe*. But even this region was not ultimate for experience. The finality of experience lay in indivisible unity: *akṣaram* *brahma*. This was known as *adhyātma*. In this region speech had no right of entry nor yet mind: *yato vāco nivartante aprāpya manasā saha*, as the *Upaniṣad* has it. It was not something manifested by speech but the very cause of the manifestation of speech itself: *yad vācā nabhyuditam, yena vāg abhyudyate*. Hence the ideal of *mauna* or silence for the aspirant who sought this. The whole body of speech, which like a cosmic *aśvattha* had its root above in *Brahman* and whose branches had spread in indescribable profusion in the world of man, and was the sound-counterpart of *saṁsāra* or relative existence, had to be dissolved before stark reality could be reached. It was only after this *ūrdhva mūla adhaśśākha aṣvattha* was cut down that the journey was to be commenced towards the goal from which there was no return. This goal was also described as *pada*, a term which in its earlier reaches, as we saw, stood for "word". It was the ultimate and supreme Goal, *tad viṣṇoḥ paramam padam*!

The Sanskrit language is the repository *par excellence* of all these sacred traditions or *Saṁskāras*. In it are enshrined the highest aspirations and achievements of our race, I should say of the whole human race. It was formed and moulded and perfected to that purpose. Its vitality has conditioned all our thinking through the ages. A study of its structure is itself a discipline in philosophy. Our philosophy is its outcome, just as Greek philosophy was born from the Greek language. There is a unique individuality in the sphere of languages. As H. G. Wells has said, "No two languages have identically the same general terms and their grammatical structure also gives a preference to this or that method of grouping and correlating words. There is no such thing as exact translation, and so the framework of the mind of an adult Frenchman or German is subtly different from that of an English speaker. Every language and every tradition carries its distinctive tendencies towards this picture of the universe or that." The individuality of the Sanskrit language is our most precious heritage. Its very sounds are fundamental: they are *bīja mantras*. To meddle with them would lead to *varṇa sankara*, than which no greater catastrophe could overtake a culture. It was a boon in disguise that Sanskrit was never much of a spoken language, and at some time in history became stabilised once for all. It is as if its assets were frozen by a kindly Providence at its highest level of realization. For us it is indeed the *deva bhāṣā*, the most exquisite instrument for unlocking the *sūkṣma* receptacle of truth and existence. Its reach extends up to the very goal which has no beyond. In its essence it is *śabda brahman*! Let us cherish this *Brahman* for evermore. Let there be no rejection. In the solemn words of the Veda: *māham brahma nirākuryām mā mā brahma nirākarōt, anirākaraṇamastu anirākaraṇamastu!*

THE AIM OF EDUCATION*

FOR a layman to address a gathering of teachers is like a patient addressing doctors, or the man in the street lecturing to a body of experts, a reversal of the normal roles. But it is not without its own value and justification. It gives the former, who has suffered as well as benefited largely at the hands of the latter, an opportunity to have his say and thus relieve his feelings. On the other hand, it will give the specialist an idea of how he looks from the other end of the telescope, and serve to remind him gently that he exists for the sake of the layman and not *vice versa*. It is good for the biter to be bit at least once in a way. In the absence of such contacts it is to be feared that each will live in a water-tight compartment much to the disadvantage of both. That is my excuse for venturing to speak to you on the aim of education.

Today more than at any previous time, education is a word of power. The greatest results are expected from it, in fact nothing less than a remaking of society and civilization. The State as well as the citizen seem to be at one in agreeing that education is the primary obligation of the State and the paramount charge on the public revenues. But it is not commonly realized that, like a variable in mathematics, the word education may have almost any content. The aims as well as methods of education have been changing from time to time, especially

---

* An Address delivered before the New Education Fellowship of Mysore in 1941.

State Museum, LUCKNOW.

in recent times, each generation often representing a reaction against the last. Teachers of today seem to be busily engaged in discovering and correcting the mistakes of their predecessors. An uneasy suspicion arises in our minds as to whether the educationists of tomorrow will not similarly have their hands full in rectifying the defects of today. It is sufficient to make us pause and try to put aside all dogmatism and cocksureness in the field of education. We see how necessary it is to clarify at the very outset what is meant by education, before proceeding to generalise. If we can settle this, the rest will be comparatively easy.

The first thing to attract our notice is the clamour for mass-education. The phrase has become a slogan with many who believe it to be a panacea for all the ills of the body politic. By mass-education its advocates generally mean the spread of literacy. Literacy is held by them to be a good in itself and identified with knowledge, while illiteracy is equated with ignorance. Thus a Western educationist says (*World Education*—1925) "I have been told that educating illiterates is just like letting them into an unlocked garden, but I said, to me it was more like opening prison doors and letting them out of the dungeon." The same idea is being echoed and even improved upon in India. For example, an enthusiast for literacy propaganda writes in a well-known Indian Journal, "The transition from illiteracy to literacy is not so much a transition from one level of ignorance to another, as it is a transition from one world to an altogether different world, from a world of superstition and acquiescence to a world of light and independent judgment."

Thoughtful men are however far from sharing this easy optimism. The immediate utility of literacy is of course not to be denied. But it is becoming more and more obvious to what an extent literates whose knowledge and judgment are otherwise at a comparatively low level, are at the mercy of mass suggestion by the very fact of their literacy. They unsuspectingly fall a prey to propaganda carried on through the cheap press which permeates every nook and corner of the social and cultural life. A nation of literates is like a prepared field in which mass suggestion can bear immediate fruit. The success of the totalitarian countries in dragooning the mind of the populace into believing whatever their leaders want them to believe is a ghastly illustration of misuse of the tool known as literacy. And it would be wrong to suppose that such abuse is the monopoly of dictators. Even in the so-called democratic and free countries the average literate is incessantly subjected to interested propaganda, which is not the less dangerous because it is insidious and often unconscious. Literacy by itself is thus not an unmixed good, but rather an instrument which cuts both ways. In any case it is not be confused with education. Undoubtedly it is a means to education, but experience has shown that, here as elsewhere, if one stops at the means it is likely to defeat the end. It would have been superfluous to reiterate so plain a conclusion had it not been for the wide prevalence of the notion that literacy and education are identical. The harmful effects of illiteracy are all on the surface and easy to recognize. But who can gauge the evils arising from the ignorance and lack of balance of the literate? It is no exaggeration to say that war on the modern international scale, or rather the mentality which makes for such war is only made possible by the indiscriminate spread and abuse of literacy. It is like sowing the wind and reaping the whirlwind.

To say that literacy is a means to education is not to admit, as popularly believed, that it is the only means. Words are organized thoughts and the conditions for communication are best when they are in closest touch—*en rapport*—with the speaker and the hearer. The spoken word has a character and fluidity, reinforced as it is by the voice and gesture and live presence of the speaker, which is wholly absent from the written word. It has also to be remembered that there are experiences which are too high for the spoken word and almost too high for thought itself: *Yato vāco nivartante aprāpya manasā saha.* On the other hand, the written word acquires a specious stability in becoming visible and static. It becomes almost a thing, impersonal and mechanised. This not only does not matter but may even work well when the correspondence between thought and thing is closest, as for example in describing the facts of the inanimate universe or their abstract relations. But its inadequacy becomes apparent when we come to deal with the phenomena of life, and all the more so with the inner world of experience and values which partakes of concreteness and individuality and refuses to be standardised. The trust in literacy as the sole means to education thus leads to the neglect and starving of the higher sides of man's personality, the drawing out of which must be the principal objective of all true education. Information and knowledge get substituted for wisdom whose very existence tends to be lost sight of.

It must have been for this reason that the great civilizations of antiquity depended so much on the spoken tradition. In Greece as well as Egypt, we are told, education was imparted wholly *viva voce.* In our own land, the great Vedic culture has been handed down across the millenniums by word of mouth, in unbroken succession from teacher to pupil. This was not because, as some shallow scholars imagine, writing had not yet been invented. Even after writing had come into vogue, the use of written texts was considered undesirable. The restriction rested on better grounds than the cheap one of keeping learning as a close preserve for the profit of certain privileged classes. What is noteworthy is that knowledge was entirely associated with the sense of hearing, as it is today being associated with the eye. The body of wisdom was called *śruti*—what is heard. Hearing—*śravaṇa*—took the place of reading. One whom we would call a well-read man was designated *bahuśruta*—one who has heard much. From hearing to thought and from thought to assimilation were the natural stages in the process of education: from *śravaṇa* to *manana* and on to *nididhyāsa.* That was the course of formal and systematic education imparted by *Guru* to *Śiṣya* either singly or in the manageable groups of a *Gurukula.* The stress was on the psychological factor, and the relation between teacher and pupil was sought to be made unique, something like the "transference" of modern psycho-analysis. On the side of the pupil were expected discipline, austerity and earnestness—*brahmacarya, tapas* and *śraddhā*—and a humility which made for receptivity, and on the other, solicitude and individual attention, and the obligation to impart without reserve the highest wisdom. The setting of the *Praśna Upaniṣad* serves as a good illustration of this. The aim was not to get hold of some words or formulæ but what lay behind them and constituted at once the personality and wisdom of the teacher. As the *Kauśītaki Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad* has it, it was the speaker that was sought to be grasped and not merely his words.

The people at the same time had their own schooling of a less systematic nature. There were ideas floating in the atmosphere, as it were, which were imbibed like the air which is breathed without effort or even awareness. There was the body of folklore conveyed through song and story and play. A word from a man of understanding at the right juncture would also work wonders in a man's mind and lead to its natural unfolding, where whole curricula of teaching and books would merely be as useless lumber. Thus slowly through the centuries the people acquired a culture which was a national heritage and asset, which could be felt and perceived although not amenable to measurement by statistics. The existence of such a widespread culture in our own country as well as in China and Japan was the first thing to strike fair-minded observers from outside. It would be unscientific not to recognize such phenomena and give them their due weight in any scheme of education. It should not be imagined that such methods were incapable of yielding mass results. The spectacle of the spread of mighty religions like Buddhism, Christianity and Islam proves the contrary. Their true place in the history of civilization would be lost sight of unless it is realised that in their own day they embodied great and successful traditions of culture and education, and signified very much more than what religion has come to mean in the modern secularised world. Once again it looks as if in an unexpected manner the spoken word will regain its place in shaping the public mind for good and ill, as the widespread use of the radio indicates. It looks as if it is going to effect a change as unpredictable as that brought about by the invention of printing five centuries ago.

But when all is said and done, the fact remains that the written word has a function to discharge which, as far as we can see, can never be dispensed with. For it serves not only as a medium of communication but also to record and preserve the vast body of impersonal knowledge of a scientific order which has been built up during the past two or three centuries and which is growing apace. It is this body of knowledge which is today the chief concern of education. It came into its own when about the third quarter of the nineteenth century the time-honoured scheme of classical education in the European Universities gave place to science. The "humanities" as they were finely called were deposed and relegated to oblivion, as being a mere cult of words and in their place was substituted a cult of things, of things that "mattered". It was a definite reversal of values and a turning back on the view-point which had dominated men's minds in the past and as such it marks the real beginning of the modern epoch. The change may be well described in the Hindu terminology, according to which all experience is due to the interplay of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*, the play of *prakṛti* being for the sake of *puruṣa*—for *puruṣārtha*. It is now as if *puruṣa* exists for the sake of *prakṛti* and not *vice versa*—man exists for the sake of science. The object has gained a victory over the subject. What the ancients considered their strong point is now deemed their principal defect. It is significant of the times that even so great a classical scholar as Gilbert Murray quotes with approval the statement of Zeller that the great weakness of all ancient thought, not excepting Socratic thought, was that instead of appealing to objective experiment it appealed to some subjective sense of fitness. For a time it looked indeed as if the triumphant onward march of the physical sciences and the obvious benefits that resulted, justified the most extraordinary hopes on behalf of the new outlook. But today the elation is considerably tempered, and man is feeling smothered by the weight of the new objects he has discovered or invented. It is as if his spirit is being squeezed out. He is beginning to wonder if he has not set in motion a power he is unable to control, and whether he has not become a slave in the grip of things and mechanisms, while all the time he was cherishing the illusion that he was dominating nature. He is dimly perceiving the truth underlying the Greek myth of King Midas and the golden touch, and the pre-eminently European legend of Faust selling his soul to the Devil. All these things are bound to have their repercussions in the educational field before long. It is not unlikely that the scales may once again be tilted, and science made to occupy a subordinate place in the scheme of general education. When it does happen it will be all for the good.

It will not be out of place here to have a glance at the scientific view of the world which forms the backbone of modern education. The fact that the earth is round and moves round the sun will serve as a good illustration. Now every child is taught this as soon as it enters the portals of the school. Yet few people realize that it is only relatively true, *i.e.*, from the standpoint of an observer on the sun, and that for all ordinary purposes the commonsense view that the earth is flat is equally valid. It is on this basis that houses are built and people walk about. Even Whittaker's Almanac speaks of the sun as rising and setting. Scientific statements are thus true only with reference to specially situated observers equipped with elaborate instruments. Their truth lies in their relevancy to their particular context, removed from which they have no legitimate bearing. Yet the prevailing tendency is to forget or ignore their background and speak of them as if they are absolute truths. They are allowed to invade man's everyday life on a par with the other facts of common observation, and work havoc by disturbing his sense of perspective. Concepts like those of geological ages, or astronomical distances are in essence mere numbers based on far-fetched calculations. They have nothing to do with time as lived and experienced. Condensed and packed into neat formulæ and introduced into man's interior they act like powerful explosives which blow up his scale of values. The Copernican theory is only one instance of the harm done by taking scientific hypotheses too seriously outside their proper

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

sphere of application. The analogy of this hypothesis has had the disastrous effect of making man believe that the self is no longer a legitimate centre of reference, and that the individual is no more than a satellite revolving round some huge disembodied entity like society or the State. Yet it is indubitably true that each man is the centre of his own world of joy and sorrow, of hope and fear. The larger entities subsist only in and through him. But strangely, it has become very different to press home this truism. It may safely be said that unless the primacy of the individual is restored, health and sanity will not return to mankind. By this it is not meant that an individual can be a completely self-centred unit independent of larger entities. This is neither possible nor desirable. But the dependence should be recognized as subsisting only through him and for him. Obligation to the environment is entitled to be given its due weight principally because it is the condition precedent of a full life for the individual, because it is *dharma*, the first and foremost ingredient of *puruṣārtha*. The ideal of *puruṣārtha* alone can form the bedrock of wholesome living.

The damage that the scientific outlook has caused is due to the substitution of the abstract mass man in place of the concrete embodied individual. An impersonal observer who is all eye and measuring instrument *plus* the Euclidean understanding ousts the live, varied and rich personality. The latter is offered up as a sacrifice to the former. This has fostered the growth of corporate and organized but sub-human entities in other spheres also. The sacrifices and the toll of human life demanded by them have thrown into shade the worst excesses of cannibalism or human sacrifice. Yet the illusion created by them is so strong that man has not only submitted to them but even exulted in his own immolation. In the words of the *Gītā*, this is the triumph of the *āsurī* side of man's nature. Under its power man embarks on a multiplicity of vain hopes, vain works and vain knowledge without real understanding, and heads for his own ruin:

> *Moghāśā moghakarmāṇo moghajñānā vicetasāḥ,*
> *Rākṣasīm āsurīm caiva prakṛtīm mōhinīm śritāḥ.*

The remedy for it lies in the recognition of the divinity which resides in every embodied individual, which man is only too prone to ignore under the glamour of *āsurī* ideals:

> *avajānanti mām mūḍhā mānuṣīm tanumāśritam,*
> *Param bhāvam ajānanto mama bhūta maheśvaram.*

This is the real significance of the ideal of *puruṣārtha*.

This stress on the person and the development of personality implied in the term *puruṣārtha* is, I should like to point out, in keeping with the best in European thought. We have the oft-quoted lines of Goethe:

> Folk and serf and conquerer
> These concede in every age:
> The sons of earth find greatest joy
> In personality alone.

They give expression to the view that everyone's ultimate aim and strongest desire lies in developing the fulness of human existence that is called personality. Thus in the words of the great psychologist Jung, "'Education for personality' has become a pedagogical ideal that turns back upon the standardised—the collective and normal—human being. . . .They yearning for personality has become a real problem that occupies many minds today." So the problem of education resolves itself into one of personality.

Our views regarding man's personality or psyche have received a remarkable extension due to recent advances in the field of psychology. Personality is no longer identified with its conscious aspect which may be called the ego. It was found that a full understanding of human behaviour is impossible unless we take into account certain mental factors which can only be inferred from their effects but cannot be directly observed either by introspection or from behaviour. These factors have been collectively termed the subconscious or unconscious. The credit of first revealing the part played by the unconscious belongs to Freud, whom McDougall compares to Newton. But it looks as if the discovery of the subconscious or submerged portion of man's psyche and of its scope and function is likely to bring about a greater change in man's outlook and ideals than either Newton's Law of Gravitation or Einstein's Theory of Relativity, because it is so much more intimate. It was in the region of psychopathology that the new studies had their birth, and they were closely connected with the investigation of the phenomena of hypnotism and of the symptoms and causes of hysteria. That they had more to do with abnormal psychology than with the healthy human psyche is a fact which has left its mark indelibly on the findings of psycho-analysis. After making allowance for this and for the undue emphasis which each of the several schools into which psycho-analysis has split up, is inclined to lay on its own special theories, there emerges a body of material which is of the utmost value to all who are interested in education.

Freud demonstrated conclusively that the larger portion of the mental life operates at subconscious levels, as it were, below the threshold of consciousness. It constitutes a sort of reservoir of energy which motivates all the instinctive urges. He showed that physical as well as neurotic symptoms could be caused by psychic "mechanisms" centred in this reservoir, and thus established what is known as the psychogenetic principle. Even in normal life the subconscious elements manifest themselves, although in a disguised form, in dreams which are in the nature of fulfilments of repressed wishes. This idea of repression plays a great part in the Freudian psychology. Repression is a process by which disagreeable experiences are relegated to the lumber room of the unconscious where they become "complexes". Under suitable conditions these complexes give rise to undesirably symptoms which represent the efforts of the repressed elements to rise to the surface in such a manner as will not allow their real nature to be discovered. All these phenomena are not of an intellectual character but have deep-seated emotional bearings. In contradistinction to the old intellectualist psychology which thought of the mind mainly as an instrument for problem solving, the Freudian approach stresses the emotional factor as the mainspring of conduct. From this standpoint, as a modern psychologist has put it, "Psychology is mainly concerned with the emotional maturing of the individual and education becomes largely a question of the wise expression and control of the emotions. Maturing is the socialising of the emotional life, first in relation to intimate groups like the family and then to wider groups. Civilization itself becomes a system for the control of the emotional life as comprehensively, and in nature's scheme more originally, than it is an enterprise of intellectual control of the resources of the environment and the skilful direction of the occupations of men in satisfaction of their needs." According to modern psychology the distinctive abnormal tendencies appear in the normal mind also, although in a restrained form, and are likely to break out under stress or excitement. Some psychologists even go to the length of saying that mankind has a natural predisposition to hysteria and that social menaces like fanaticism or war are in the nature of hysterical excesses. In this view, the problem of civilization lies in reducing the native hysteria of the human race, and the essential aim of education is to provide for emotional stability and control by subduing and directing to desirable ends the innate hysterical trends.

In this summary of the tendencies of Freudian psycho-analysis no reference has been made to controversial details or technique and methods. A comparison with other psycho-analytical schools will however bring out much interesting and useful matter. For Freud the unconscious is purely an individual affair consisting almost wholly of repressed complexes. But Jung, the most famous among his pupils, holds that the unconscious is not entirely an individual product, but that dream analysis and other evidence go to show that there is

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

indisputably something like a collective and racial unconscious which ingresses into the individual psyche. The motivating power which Freud attributes wholly to sex is generalised by Jung into a concept of psychic energy which he calls the *libido*. Freud's teaching disclosed the darker side of the human psyche and roused a storm of protest and opposition. But Jung believes that it was a regrettable error on Freud's part to believe that the psyche has no radiant side because it has been explained from the shadow side. Freud's central idea of adaptation to environment more or less on the lines of evolutionary biology envisages a conflict between what he calls the "pleasure" principle which dominates the inner world of fantasy on the one hand, and the "reality" principle supposed to originate in the pressure of things and the stern demands of society on the other. Jung however is convinced that human problems cannot all be explained on the mechanical basis of adaptation to an imaginary rigid environment, that the ideal of adaptation is all right for neurotic or unsuccessful people, but that it does not meet the case of gifted individuals to whom the world really owes all its advances. While recognizing that there are morbid fantasies, he has a very high opinion of the role played by fantasy, which he identifies with the spirit of play and the creative imagination. For him it is actually "the maternally creative side of the masculine spirit". In general it may be said that Jung's views are more profound and mark a great advance on Freud, providing a fresh orientation to the human spirit, investing mythology, religious ritual and mystic experience once again with a deep psychological basis and significance and redeeming man's inner life from the shadow and stigma of unreality and superstition.

What is of special interest to us is the surprising affinity between Jung's conclusions and Hindu thought. He himself is well aware of it. He thinks that it was no mere accident that soon after the French Revolution the Frenchman Anquetil du Perron brought to Europe a translation of the *Upaniṣads* "which gave the Western world its first deep insight into the baffling mind of the East". He says, "To the historian this is mere chance without any factors of cause and effect. But in view of my medical experience I cannot take it as an accident. .... In the crowds that poured into the Notre Dame, bent on destruction, dark and nameless forces were at work that swept the individual off his feet; these forces worked also upon Anquetil du Perron and provoked an answer which has come down in history. For he brought the Eastern mind to the West, and its influence upon us we cannot measure. Let us beware of under-estimating it!" He has a great respect for the Eastern civilizations which had discovered and learnt to use the resources of the subliminal mind. In his own words, "Great and enduring civilizations like those of the Hindus and the Chinese were built upon this foundation and developed from it a discipline of self-knowledge which they brought to a high pitch of refinement both in philosophy and practice." He adds that Western psychology is only just beginning to advance "to fill the void which hitherto has marked the psychic insufficiency of Western culture as compared with that of the East. We Occidentals had learnt to tame and subject the psyche, but we knew

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

nothing about its methodical development and its functions." It looks as if after the lapse of centuries the West is slowly coming to recognize the Self as the source of all knowledge and power, a realization which is sure to shift the emphasis in education from the outside to the inside. As the *Upaniṣad* describes it, the Self is that which being known, all else becomes known. This is the highest *puruṣārtha—paramārtha*.

In Hindu psychology the collective unconscious was called the *avyakta*, the individual unconscious more or less corresponding to *adṛṣṭa*. When the Indian mentality characteristically referred to the insufficiency of conscious endeavour and held that the fruits of action depend on *adṛṣṭa*, it was not so much a weak resignation to fate as a wise acknowledgment of the part played by the unconscious in the affairs of men. *Adṛṣṭa* was not considered as arbitrary or chaotic in its workings, but as comprising the individual's *vāsanas* or *saṁskāras*, the subtle relics and memories, the psychic counterparts of all activity and feeling—of motion and emotion. The operation of causation in this field was explained by the doctrine of *karma*, the ultimate and logical expansion of what in its limited application is today called the law of psycho-genesis. We cannot follow these topics into all their fascinating implications. For us the main point of interest is that in the development of personality we have to take into account a whole which far transcends the conscious ego which has hitherto been in the focus of educational practice. Summing up, we may say that the chief concern of education ought to be the building up of personality in its fullest sense and not the mere imparting of information however useful it may be. Information is like food, but personality is like the vitality—*prāṇa*—which assimilates food. Mankind is today suffering from a plethora of food which is beyond its powers of digestion. The aim of education should be to keep the digestion tuned up a little in advance of the food. To this end even fasting and starvation for a time may be beneficial. But wholesale changes in the method and content of education are neither practicable nor necessary. What is wanted is essentially a shift of emphasis in the minds of those who guide the course of education. If only they will remember what the true aim of education ought to be, then the way will be paved for the realization of *puruṣārtha* through education.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH HINDUISM?

THERE is an impression in many quarters that there is something wrong within the body of Hinduism. This view finds expression in an article under the striking title '*Hindu versus Hindu*' and again '*The Great War in Hinduism*' from the pen of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia which appeared in the press recently. The thesis is thought-provoking and original, and has been presented in a plausible manner. According to the learned author, the greatest war of Indian history, a war between the liberal and the fanatical in Hinduism, has raged for over 5,000 years. Although this should have been the main strand round which India's history should have been woven, yet, strange to say, even incidental mention of it is rare in books on history. Conflict between the liberal and the fanatical has featured in the history of almost all the religions—Christianity, Islam and Buddhism and has actually led to splits, but Hinduism alone has known no such split. Notwithstanding continual disintegration into sects, the invading sect has been absorbed in Hinduism as an additional unit. Hence the conflict has remained unresolved, and Hinduism has become "a system of expanding exploration, as much as it is the hunting ground of the irrational and the fanatical".

In the perspective of this conflict he tries to depict four major issues *viz.*, caste, women, property and tolerance. He identifies the two factors in the conflict with the opposing processes of unification and disintegration of the country, and offers a reading of Indian history according to which the unity of the country has taken place only when liberal Hinduism held sway over the Hindu mind, while fanatical fervour has always led to the disintegration of the Indian people as a state and as a community. He asserts that this conflict between liberal and fanatical Hinduism has at present taken the outward form of their different attitudes towards Muslims. The war can be brought to a close only by the triumph of Hindu liberalism. Fanatical Hinduism has an insidious but persistent way of creeping into the liberal camp, but there should be no compromise. Such in brief is the thesis.

The four major issues on which Dr. Lohia harps with the insistence of a refrain demand separate and careful examination. Foremost among them comes the question of toleration, for in many respects this is crucial; it dominates the entire picture and it is with regard to this primarily that the justification or otherwise of the use of the term fanatical can be gauged. Conservative or even reactionary would perhaps have served the author's purpose. But the author deliberately prefers the word fanatical and rings his changes on it. Why? The reason is not far to seek; he seeks to identify the mentality with that of the assassin of Mahatma Gandhi and to enlist popular emotion on behalf of his theme and to queer the pitch in advance. It is the proverbial giving of a bad name to a dog as a preliminary to hanging it. But as a matter of fact, no word would be less appropriate for describing any aspect of Hinduism. Even hostile foreign critics would readily agree to this. Had not our author, who claims to speak from the inside, been so insistent about it, it would have been unnecessary to labour the point.

The Oxford Dictionary defines a fanatic as "a person filled with excessive and mistaken enthusiasm, especially in religion". This is always accompanied by intolerance of other people's opinions and followed by aggressive action to impose one's own views on them. But tolerance of others' views has been the distinguishing feature of the Hindu outlook. What Troeltsch means when he asserts that the truth of religion is 'polymorphic' was recognised millenniums ago in the *Ṛgveda* when it declared that although the truth of existence was one only, still it lent itself to being described variously, without affecting its validity: *Ekam sad viprā bahudhā vadanti*. In the words of Dr. Radhakrishnan "The different revelations do not contradict, but on many points confirm one another. For the Hindu, religions differ not in their object but in their renderings of its nature". This was not a mere doctrine but an attitude which has permeated the Hindu mind through and through. Far from being anxious to impose its ideas or ways of life on others, it has, on the contrary, been exclusive and resisted all entry into its fold. There has been no propaganda and no seeking of converts, and in this respect it has radically differed even from its first cousin—Buddhism. Hinduism has practised toleration almost to a fault and has been the least fanatical of religions. If Dr. Lohia's thesis were correct, incidents like the dastardly assassination of Mahatmaji would have been common in Indian history. But they are conspicuous by their absence. Religious persecution too has not disfigured the annals of Hinduism as has unfortunately been the rule with religion in other countries. The misguided assassin of Mahatmaji was a freak and more a victim of modern political ferments. To identify such an act with Hindu tradition even at its worst, would be absurd and fantastic. Hinduism has admittedly been the least politically-minded among religions; otherwise the history of India would have been altogether different.

That the principle of tolerance has dominated the Hindu outlook is indeed recognized by Dr. Lohia, although somewhat reluctantly. "The element of tolerance has" he admits "almost always been stronger than the element of coercion". But then he objects that it is rooted in the principle of unity in diversity with which our author will have no truck. For him "within the principle of unity in diversity lies concealed the seed of decay and disintegration". Thus, what most would hold and rightly hold to be the crowning glory of Hinduism is to our author its principal weakness. He has no sympathy for the Hindu brand of toleration based on "various possibilities of what is right". He complains that Hinduism "concedes that doctrines and usages may vary and is not prepared to arbitrate among them. It wishes for no uniform pattern in the conduct of men's lives, not even a voluntary uniformity, and what it wishes for is that undefinable unity in diversity which it has in the past so successfully threaded through all its sects. Its quality of tolerance therefore rises out of the creed of non-interference, out of the belief that variations need not necessarily be wrong but are different expressions of what is right".

He contrasts this attitude of mind, and to its disadvantage, with the type of tolerance associated with European rationalism. He is all admiration for Voltaire who "knew his opponent to be wrong and yet he was prepared to fight the battle for toleranee for his opponent's right to say what he wanted". For Dr. Lohia even tolerance is a matter of fighting—for a "right". He realises, however, that on this point the liberal Hindu is at one with the so-called fanatical. Accordingly even liberal Hinduism is unable to solve the problem, for it is also tarred by the same brush. He has no patience with it: He says "It is tiresome to watch Hinduism continually splitting into sects each with its own jarring noises, and however much liberal Hinduism may seek to cover them with the mantle of unity they inevitably produce a weakness in corporate living of the State". For Dr. Lohia this is not toleration but an "amazing nonchalance". He is worried that "no one worries about the continual splitting, as if every one is sure that they are parts of one another". One may comment in passing, that our author has apparently no sympathy for the processes of organic life in which the cells continually go on dividing "as if everyone is sure that they are parts of one another". He also ignores the analogy that life demands a colloidal basis, and that the hard, inorganic, crystalline, logical and clear-cut, mutually exclusive forms which he favours, spell death.

For our author the fanatical has always been continuously and insidiously poaching into the sphere of the liberal. As a matter of fact, there has throughout been interpenetration rather than conflict, thus giving the lie to the entire thesis. He fails to realize that these trends represent those opposing movements which in their apparent antagonism constitute the fundamental rhythm of life—like the outgoing and intaking breaths or the systole and diastole of the heart. For such nuances our author has no use or appreciation. Accordingly his ostensible plea that "liberal Hindus alone can sustain this state" sounds hollow. He has little faith in the liberal Hindu, for he realizes that on all fundamentals the liberal is in agreement with the so-called fanatical: *e.g.*, in regard to the author's *bete noir*, the principle of unity in diversity. He says "A common error however in the understanding of this principle consists in the belief that liberal Hinduism has always been open to good ideas and influences no matter where they came from, while fanatical Hinduism is not. This to my mind is an illiterate belief." According to his reading of history, in India in the days of freedom there was mainly a one way traffic in ideas. India was an exporter of ideas and did not go searching for them in foreign lands, while enslaved India has shown a remarkable alacrity to ape the foreigner. This self-sufficiency of mind in freedom and its total supineness under slavery is, to use the author's own words, a weakness of Hinduism which has never been recognized. He proceeds to the conclusion which is not logical but very much to our point. Says he, "It is unfortunate that liberal Hindus in their illiteracy are spreading contrary ideas for propaganda purposes." Presumably among those illiterate liberal Hindus are men like Dr. Radhakrishnan who are never tired of stressing on the "hospitality of the Hindu mind" as its distinguishing feature throughout its long history.

Dr. Lohia's real sympathies are obviously elsewhere. His admiration for Voltaire gives us the clue. On reading the article one gathers the impression that far from being at war with each other, "fanatical" and "liberal" Hinduism have all along been co-operating in some unspeakable manner in order to keep the Hindu religion going. Rather than suffer this, he would rather "combat religion itself". He would precipitate an open conflict, with the solemn exhortation to allow no quarter, in the hope that after liberal Hinduism has been used to liquidate the "fanatical", it will itself obligingly fade out. But then he is not prepared to wait, and he is also apprehensive of the result. He says "It may be suggested that the best way to end this war between liberal and fanatical Hinduism is to combat religion itself. That may indeed be so, but the process is tardy and where is the guarantee that the clever old rogue might not swallow up the anti-religious as one of its numerous sects?"

He comes to the root cause of the trouble. "Back of all these unresolved conflicts" he goes on "is the metaphysical problem of the relationship between appearance and reality. There is indeed little difference in the attitudes of liberal and fanatical Hinduism with regard to this problem. This denial of reality to appearances may have coloured the views of philosophers in other countries; but in India our author deplores that it has "seeped into the faith of the mass of the people". For this he would gladly substitute the scientific and secular spirit with the "ethical content of Christianity" added on, which he admits is a "pre-eminently European habit of life and thinking". He believes that the Hindu idea of the relationship between the real and the apparent or phenomenal has given the Hindu a "split personality". This is a specimen of extreme loose thinking. "Split personality" is a term which has acquired a certain vogue in modern psychology for indicating the result of an unrecognized conflict between subconscious complexes or between the subconscious and conscious elements. An integral view held in esteem and subscribed to with all the force of one's being can obviously not lead to a split personality. On Dr. Lohia's own admission Hinduism "does not indeed decry phenomenon as false but deems it only of a lower order to be submerged in the mind's ascent to higher reality". Where then is the conflict and between whom? If indeed Dr. Lohia is sincere when he says that in India this "philosophy has been set to music and turned into faith," there is no room for conflict and much less for a split personality. At the worst it could only result in some form of anæmia.

When the diagnosis is so hopelessly mistaken one cannot lay much store by the prescription. But it is not without interest as being a sort of confession of faith on the part of the author. This is his panacea. "Not until the Hindu learns to accept the facts of life in the scientific and secular spirit, facts relating to work and machine and output and family and growth of population and hunger and tyranny and the like is there any hope for him to overcome his split personality and to deal a deathblow to the fanaticism that has been his undoing in the past."

Clearly the conflict and the split do not lie where our author projects them. The conflict is not old and certainly not within the traditional body of Hinduism. It is a recent outgrowth and is imbedded in the minds of those over-educated Hindus whose enthusiasm for the Western scientific secular spirit makes them anxious to cut their links with the racial past and whose pathological struggles in that direction lead to neurosis and a split personality. It is the jaundiced eye which paints the whole world yellow. Hinduism can only reply "Physician, heal thyself." Incidentally, it is curious to note in this connection the author's claim that the "illiterate village folk" are on his side *i.e.*, that of "liberalism" while his opponents the "fanatical elements in Hinduism obtain their systematic support" from the urban and better educated sections of the population. What a strange travesty of the facts! Later on when dealing with caste it will be made clear that actually it is the other way round. It reminds one of the bad old days of foreign domination when our rulers made a similar claim and posed as the protectors of the masses as against a handful of political agitators drawn from the educated classes. The high-brow ideology of the day *viz.*, evolutionary materialism with a dash of "liberal democratic humanism" seems to be closely following the footsteps of its imperialist predecessor.

Enough has been said on the issue of toleration. It was necessary to go into it at some length as it affected the whole question of outlook and direction. We now come to something more tangible and mundane *viz.*, property. The author's views on this point are far from clear. He admits that the question of property in its present form of private versus social ownership is a recent one. He also concedes that the sense of property in Hinduism is liberalized by its faith in non-accumulation and non-attachment. But the theory of Karma comes in like the villain of the piece to lend its sanction for perpetuating vested interests and the existing order. The fanatical Hindu has exploited this for his own purposes. But unfortunately for Dr. Lohia's thesis, history does not show that the liberal Hindu ever interpreted the doctrine in any different way. There has also never been any conflict between non-attachment and the sanctioned order as envisaged by the author. The doctrine of non-attachment has always been there as a necessary corrective forming an integral part of the orthodox scheme. Practice has of course been varied according to the fitness of the individual. This is the doctrine of *adhikāra* or appropriateness which forms the backbone of *Varṇaśrama Dharma*. Apart from this, the attitude of the Hindu towards property has not differed materially from that associated with other religions. It is therefore difficult to follow Dr. Lohia when he generalises that "As with other issues, the Hindu has never been able to carry his thinking on the question of property to its logical conclusion." It is not a defect of Hinduism that it has recognized the wholeness of life and the need for reconciling the antinomies, and that it has not allowed logic to crush out life. That is its distinction and justification. Besides, the author does not tell us what that "logical conclusion" is. But whatever that may be, for our purposes, it is sufficient to note that on the question of property Hinduism has not differed materially from other religions, nor has there been any difference of opinion forming an issue as between the liberal and the fanatical.

Nowhere is the tendentious nature of the thesis better seen than in the description of the position of the Hindu woman. The place of woman in a civilization masculine in its origin and emphasis, was naturally subordinate and dependent all the world over till very recently. It was not a feature peculiar to Hinduism. The question cannot be rightly judged except against the European perspective. The dependent position of woman in European countries from the earliest times till almost the other day is well known to every student. In Roman law a woman was even in historic times completely dependent. If married she and her property passed into the power of her husband; if unmarried she was (unless a vestal vergin) under the perpetual tutelage of her father during his life, and after his death, of her agnates, that is, those of her kinsmen by blood or adoption who would have been under the power of the common ancestor had he lived. Failing agnates, the tutelage probably passed to the gens. The wife was the purchased property of her husband, and, like a slave, acquired only for his benefit. A woman could not exercise any civil or public office. Of course, there was some amelioration as time passed by.

The advent of Christianity did not tend to any particular improvement, for Christianity was ruled by the dictum of St. Paul who definitely assigns subservience as the proper function of women, and by the views of the early Church Fathers who looked upon women mainly as inheriting the temptress function of Eve. In the northern countries which for long did not come under the influence of Rome or Christianity, the position was even worse. Thus we learn that among the Scandinavian races, women were under perpetual tutelage, whether married or unmarried. This continued all over Europe well into the Middle Ages.

Even in enlightened England the position was similar whether with regard to women's rights to property or their civil or political status. The early situation can be sampled from the fact that in the time of Ethelbert a law was enacted that if a man carried off a freeman's wife, he must at his own expense procure the husband another wife. The legal rights which an English married woman possessed at the time of Magna Carta were actually whittled down, until by the time of Glanvil her person and property had become during her husband's life time entirely at his disposal and after his death limited to her dower and her *pars rationabilis*. It is within our own memory that *Satyāgraha* was offered by the Suffragettes from 1906 onwards, and that as late as 1910 women did not have the franchise there. In that year, the attempt to get a private bill, then before Parliament referred to a Grand Committee was lost by 175 votes, and the Bill was opposed as undemocratic by Lloyd George and other Liberals!

Against this background the position of women in Hinduism through the centuries is something to be proud of. Even the most cursory survey of our literature and history will bear this out. Let us hear what a highly educated Hindu lady (Padmini Sengupta) has written recently in her book *Everyday life in Ancient India*:

"Though many rules and customs restricted an orthodox Hindu woman's life until very recent times, the position of women in ancient India was free and emancipated, and women were well-educated and respected members of society. A wife shared all her husband's privileges and was his companion and help-mate in his activities." Although Manu thought that women are not fit for independence, his attitude may be summed up in his words: Where women are honoured the gods are pleased. As a matter of fact every one knows that the position of women in the Hindu household was far better than could be guessed from the Law-books. How else could it be in a culture which placed the Mother before the Father in priority for reverence? *Matṛ devo bhava*—was the first *Upaniṣadic* exhortation to the young. So far as we know, Hinduism is also the only religion whose symbolism places the Feminine on a par with the Masculine in the profound concept of *Śiva-Śakti* culminating in the image of *Ardhanārī-Iśvara.* The Hindu has honoured his country as his Motherland—*Bhārat Māta* and his nationalism has grown up from the seed *Mantra—Vande-Mātaram.*

Dr. Lohia says that the Hindu woman today finds herself in a strange situation: both liberal and fanatical. But that has always been the case, if one will only be liberal enough to see that liberty and discipline have always been mutual correctives. That was the view of Manu, whose integrated outlook is characteristic of classical Hinduism, and which finds expression in the oft repeated statement that Manu's word is medicine. There is not a shred of evidence for believing that the liberal attitude towards women prevails during luminous periods of Hinduism and the contrary during fanatical periods. This is a figment of the author's brain and a fruitful cause of misunderstanding. There are no such contrasted periods, nor has any scholar ventured to suggest that consecutive verses of *Manu Dharmaśāstra* belong to different ages. Dr. Lohia has a foreboding that "The fanatical and the liberal will remain intertwined as long as the Hindu refuses to accept his woman as a human being similar to himself." It may be replied that the intertwining of complementary factors pictured in the figure of *Ardhanārī-Īśvara* is the symbol of the Hindu's complete acceptance of woman as an integral part of himself, in short as his *Ardhāngī*. Dr. Lohia's failure to appreciate this is the cause of all the confusion. Hinduism has never lost sight of the fundamental fact that man and woman are not equal in the literal sense, but that their specific biological and mental functions are complementary. They are like the centrifugal and centripetal forces whose interaction keeps the earth in its orbit: if these should cease to function even for a moment, it will fly off at a tangent. That would be the fate of humanity and civilization if woman were to unsex herself and ape man in all his masculine activities, to the neglect of her own *Dharma*. Hinduism has tried to maintain the equilibrium by insisting on the difference between the sexes, and preserving the uniqueness of each while fully recognising their common human nature.

The realization that it is only in her relationship with man that the beauty and greatness of woman reveals itself, made Hindu literary critics give the highest rank among the *Rasas* to *Śṛngāra*, the very peak of aesthetic experience. What more gracious picture has the world's literature to offer comparable to that sacred ideal of Hindu womanhood symbolized in Sita and Savitri, Damayanti and Śakuntala? Have not these been the unfailing source of inspiration to countless Sitas and Savitris who have blessed even the humblest of Hindu households from time immemorial? Even at the risk of a little digression, it is worth our while to call to mind the boundless enthusiasm which was evoked in Europe when *Śakuntala* was first translated into the European languages, an enthusiasm so sincere and expressed in such superlative terms that sophisticated orientalists of a later date are at a loss to understand it. It was looked upon as a wonder, coming from "the land of wonders". Men like Herder and the great Goethe hailed it with delight. Almost half a century later, in 1830, in his late old age, Goethe wrote to Chezy, the French editor of the Sanskrit text of *Śakuntala*. "The first time I became aware of this unfathomable work it excited such an enthusiasm in me and attracted me so much that I never left off studying it. . . . . ." Goethe's well-known epigram on Śakuntala will bear repitition:

> Wouldst thou the young year's blossoms and the fruits of its decline,
> And all by which the soul is charmed, enraptured, feasted, fed,
> Wouldst thou the earth and Heaven itself in one sole name combine?
> I name thee, O Śakuntala, and all at once is said.

It looks like sacrilege to speak of 'fanatical' and 'liberal' in such a context.

At last we have arrived at the vexed question of caste. To our surprise, the author dismisses it briefly after mentioning a few commonplaces which betray his lack of familiarity with the real background. Admittedly caste is more or less out of joint with modern Western ideas. For the last century or so, reformers have been incessantly dilating on the enormities of caste. Those who speculated on its future, fifty years ago, thought they saw the order tottering, and predicted its total disappearance within a few years as the result of the impact of Western education. But it seems to have a strange phoenix-like vitality. Sir Herbert Risley, a competent but by no means friendly critic, sensed this even as long back as 1915. Today in the words of Sir Rustom Masani, himself an observer from outside the Hindu fold, all such predictions have proved to be false. There has been a remarkable veering round of opinion on the subject among scholars. According to Dr. Lohia himself, caste has become a habit of mind with the Hindu, who, even if he will not argue for the system, will rarely act against it. That must be sufficient to make one pause and search for the causes of this persistent vigour.

Caste for good or ill is a formidable sociological factor which has to be reckoned with, for its power cannot be under-rated nor can its elimination be envisaged anywhere in the near future. The experience of the last few years should convince any thoughtful person on this point. Although unique in its Indian form, it is only a development of a natural tendency which has atrophied in other countries. Essentially it is biological in origin. It differs from most other current sociological theories in the fact that it makes the family the basic unit in society, and considers it pernicious to think of the individual isolated from the normal family attachments. To try to build up a society purely on an economic or political basis is doomed to failure at least in India. These factors are entirely rational. Dr. Lohia pleads for a synthesis of the emotive with the rational but he fails to see that man's emotional life starts with the family and is to a large extent bound up with the family. In India, *Bhakti* itself recognised nine types (*nava vidhā bhakti*) all modelled on the lines of the typical family relationships, between the child and its parent, and the converse, and so on, culminating in the highest form: the relationship between the lover and the beloved. The caste group was the natural extension of the family and merely interposed a necessary intermediate link between the family on the one hand and society at large on the other. It would be the part of wisdom that this existing structure and predisposition should be utilised by all those who would plan for a better India. By all means, let the admitted excesses and excrescences of caste be pruned and rectified but let not the baby be thrown out with the unclean water in the bath tub. Our author says that "No force can unite it (India) except the voluntary human will." Nothing could be less true. Unless the subconscious and traditional forces are recognised and made use of, the task will be impossible. Whatever organic unity is to be found in India is entirely due to this wonderful system which has kept India together through the centuries. It sought to integrate differences of disposition and character on the assumption that blood is thicker than water. On the economic side, the system was a compromise between individualism and

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

collectivism, between unrestrained competition and constrained co-operation. It has even been described as 'ancient, time-tested, scientific socialism', maintaining the balance of power between the vocational classes. The concept of organic unity and interdependence ran through the whole system. Society was not figured by Hinduism as a conglomeration of primitive unicellular organisms like amoeba. The caste system sought to make it a real evolved and developed organism comparable to Man. That was the idea embedded in the famous *Puruṣa Sūkta*. There was no question of rivalry or antagonism between the organs and limbs, but together they had to function to give vitality to the body politic.

The author imagines that the Brahmin imposed the system on the others. Nothing could be farther from the truth. No doubt the Brahmins enjoyed special privileges in the scheme. But they were certainly not the final arbiters in matters of caste. It was the caste *Panchayet* that decided all matters, in accordance with custom. As Dr. Ketkar has pointed out, an appeal against expulsion from caste to the Brahmins was useless. Their part was merely to declare what was the pattern of behaviour which had scriptural approval, when such reference was needed; but that was rarely. According to Hutton, a recent authority on the subject, the ultimate sanction for caste was secular, and rested in the ruler according to the Law-books as well as in practice. It was the ruler's primary duty at all times to see that the system was maintained and that each caste performed its functions. That was the case even during Buddhist epochs when Brahmin influence was at its lowest, and continued so through the Middle Ages.

Dr. Lohia's assertion that Shivaji was forced to agree that his dynasty should always choose its ministers from among the Brahmins is unfounded. On the other hand there is every reason to believe that Shivaji was himself an ardent believer in the *Varṇāśrama Dharma* and considered it his Heaven-ordained mission to re-establish it in the country. Neither his tactics nor his policy were dictated by the Brahmins, however much he might have revered them. There is also not the least ground for holding with Dr. Lohia that "the bright periods of the Mauryas and the Guptas follow upon a comprehensive attack on the caste system." The exact contrary is the case. It may be catagorically affirmed that the great periods of Indian History whether Hindu or Buddhist, ancient or medieval, have been periods of conservation followed by a revival of Hinduism, as in the time of the Mauryas as well as of the Guptas, of Vijayanagara as well as of Shivaji. On the other hand, liberalism has characterised periods of disintegration. It is significant that the liberal cult of Bhakti was popularised by Ramanuja about the time of the Muslim invasion of India. *Bhakti* was essentially a reformist and protestant movement which sought to preserve the essence as against forms. Its vogue has been greatest precisely in such ages and regions as succumbed to alien sway. For example, in the Deccan which prior to Shivaji had come under the Muslim domination, the cult made great headway and produced a galaxy of saints. That was the case also in the North. But in the South which did not come under

Muslim influence, caste has always been at its strongest. In the heyday of Vijayanagar as well as under Shivaji and his successors, regard for formal and organized Hinduism prevailed. This is inevitable on the analogy of life. The heart may be the most fundamental organ in the body. But an attempt to keep up the functioning of the heart is a step resorted to only when life is *in extremis*. In normal and healthy times a varied and rich life of the limbs and senses is the rule. Specialization and the development of forms mark the direction of the growth of life, and the contrary marks periods of decay and senility. Buddhism started as a protest and reaction. It was the effect as well as cause of the disintegration of Hinduism. But the reaction soon worked itself out. Its development into the *Mahāyāna* which was, according to Hindu ideas, the line of normal development. In its regard for forms and symbolism and rituals it outdid Hinduism itself. That was what the Chinese tourists found in India. Hiouen Tsang's description of India in the reign of Harsha and of the worships found at Nalanda will leave no doubt on this point. It is unnecessary to pile up evidence as the author has contented himself with bare assertions.

In passing, it may be pointed out that although out of the 3,000 odd castes found in India, as many as 1,800 are sub-divisions among the Brahmins themselves, it is not within these that caste rivalries have been most powerful or persistent. The historic conflicts in South India between the eighteen castes of the Right Hand and nine castes of the Left Hand are ample testimony to this. This distinction of Right and Left operates strongly among the untouchables also. But the Brahmin is altogether outside of this. The prejudice regarding untouchability is still at its strongest in the rural areas where even today the caste Hindu will not allow the untouchable to use his well; and even among untouchables, the Right Hand denies the favour to his Left Hand brethren and *vice versa*. Dr. Lohia's fond belief that "the long wisdom of centuries makes the (illiterate) village folk tolerant" is moonshine. An afternoon's walk into his nearest village should be sufficient to convince him that the contrary is the case. The very instance that he gives *viz.*, that the Hindu barber will not shave the untouchable Hindu while he will be only too willing to serve the non-Hindu, shows where the prejudice is entrenched deepest. The Brahmin was neither the author nor the protagonist of the caste system. At one time he was its god and today he is its victim.

Dr. Lohia says "At the same time two formidable revolts seem to have taken place against the caste system in ancient times." He does not tell us what they were or when they took place. But if he intends Buddhism as one of the two, history will not bear him out, for as we have seen, caste distinctions were equally rampant during the Buddhist period when Brahmin dominance was at its lowest ebb. His statement that "a whole *Upaniṣad* is devoted to the complete and entire demolition of the caste system" raises a smile. There is no such *Upaniṣad*. Every *Upaniṣad* purports to point the way of withdrawal from action: *Nivṛtti*, and thus may appear to deprecate the *Vedas* themselves and the prescriptions and prohibitions of *Dharma*: *vidhi* and *niṣedha*. But then, the *Upaniṣads* do not claim to lay down rules of conduct for everyday life but belong to an entirely different "universe of discourse". They are part of the *Āraṇyakas* meant for those few who have retired from the world in order to seek *Brahman*. Many of the *Upaniṣads* are also far anterior to the *Dharma Śāstras* and they cannot in any sense be interpreted as revolts against them. The core of Hinduism as expounded in the *Gītā* is that there is a level of duty appropriate to each class a individual: *Svadharma*.

Dr. Lohia's principal objection to the caste system is based on his belief that it works against the growth of a spirit of nationalism and against the unity of the State. That is a common misconception and requires correction. The Hindu has always been conscious of the unity of India. Indeed, that has been the warp and woof of Hindu thought. He has also never been hostile to other religions. But he has not favoured a militant nationalism based entirely on secular geographical considerations. He has always co-operated with the State and has placed social tranquillity above other considerations. He has given his allegiance to whichever Government prevailed. Even during alien rule, he did not change his dogma: *Rājā pratyakṣa devatā*. As admonished by Christ, he was ever prepared to give Cæsar his due. But at the same time he was convinced that there were higher values worth preserving and he was not and is not prepared to make a cult of the State. That is Dr. Lohia's main charge against Hinduism itself. But the same charge could be levelled with equal justice against every other religion also. By its very nature, it is obvious that a religion cannot give secular values the highest rank without ceasing to be a religion. In Shakespeare's words "The very head and front of its offending then hath this extent, no more." But the propagandists of secularism are not content with this. It remains to see whether they will succeed where all others have failed. Prof. Arnold Toynbee after a masterly survey of the entire course of history comes to the conclusion that the decay of civilization is always marked by the predominance of interest in politics and economics and the subordination of all other values to this sole value. That Hinduism would resist what Toynbee has called the "twin enormities of political and economic nationalism" is the cause for Dr. Lohia's hostility. In the weighty words of Prof. Toynbee, "This attitude of mind, which sterilized fanaticism at the cost of extinguishing faith, has lasted from the seventeenth century into the twentieth, and has been carried to such lengths in all parts of our Westernized 'Great Society' that it is beginning at last to be recognized for what it is. It is being recognized, that is to say, as the supreme danger to the spiritual health and even to the material existence of the Western body social—a deadlier danger, by far, than any of our hotly advertised political and economic maladies".

Dr. Lohia's curious statement that "the Brahmin-Bania combination has ruled India for good and evil through the centuries, a rule alternating between the liberal and the fanatical" although not historically tenable is a symptom of the author's deep-seated antagonism towards religion on the one hand represented by the Brahmin, and capitalism on the other typified by the Bania. What does he himself advocate? He admits

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preseyation Foundation, Chandigarh

that Europe is dying of strife born out of a too one-sided acceptance of appearances, and India is dying of stagnation resulting from an equally one sided acceptance of the reality behind things. Yet he goes on, "I have no doubt that I would prefer to die of strife than of stagnation." Strife is conflict and violence. Europe is dying of it and yet he would like India to tread the same path, as the "live and let live" practised by India is to him nothing but stagnation. But India has stood solidly through the centuries, Buddhist and Hindu and Jain, for non-violence and it is in the fitness of things that it was re-affirmed by its latest prophet—Mahatma Gandhi.

But to do justice to our author, we must notice that he asks, somewhat plaintively, whether these are the only two courses of thinking and conduct open to man, and whether a third course is not feasible. Dr. Lohia is unaware that at least three thousand years ago Hinduism offered a third alternative as against the usual dichotomies like good and evil offered by other faiths. Neither strife (called *Rajas* by the Hindus) nor stagnation (designated *Tamas*) was the goal of Hinduism, but a third quality called *Sattva* for which there is no exact equivalent in English and which stands for a unique experience, representing energy in repose, rhythm, equilibrium and light. That was the primary objective of the Hindu religious quest. It was realisable and it was realised. Short of that, the Hindu would prefer stagnation (*Tamas*) to strife (*Rajas*). Because the god *Brahmā* symbolises *Rajas*, he has been denied worship in classical Hinduism. Such is the Hindu temperament and the Hindu can no more discard it than he can jump out of his own skin.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

For good and evil he must make the best of it. He is convinced that even *Tamas* is consistent with the preservation of life and the conservation of peaceful and civilized values. But strife and conflict mean intolerance and ultimately death. Hinduism has never stood for conflict either within or without. Hence that age-old thrice-repeated prayer: *Om Śāntih, Śāntih, Śāntih.*

पुस्तकालय
विषय ग-2
पुस्तक का संख्या 60
Lucknow

SOME OPINIONS:

"Mr. Dutt deserves the gratitude of students of Indian philosophy for having vindicated its status and prestige..... From the performance of professional philosophers (in the sense of academic teachers of philosophy) it is a relief and a distinct pleasure to turn to the work of Mr. Dutt, who has leavened philosophical discussions and debates with the layman's open-hearted outlook and refreshing realism, and uniquely unsophisticated urbanity." —*Indian Express.*

"Lively and thought-provoking." —*Hindu.*

"All the themes are thought-provoking and have been presented in an interesting and instructive manner..... The volume deserves to be read, digested and assimilated by all students of comparative thought and civilizations."

—*The Twentieth Century.*

"Packed with thought and learning..... amply repays perusal. His gift of lucid presentation compels attention." —*The Aryan Path.*

"It is written throughout in a simple and interesting style; and it reveals not only a wide acquaintance with ancient Indian thought, but also a happy faculty for interpreting it..... The book, as a whole, brings out very well the prominent place given to the higher values in the Indian scheme of life; and this feature of it, I am sure, will increase its appeal to the modern reader, who is witnessing the tragic consequences of ignoring them." —*Prof. M. Hiriyanna.*

"I have read the whole book from cover to cover and I have read it with pleasure and appreciation. I have been particularly impressed by your last five addresses and especially the one on 'Philosophy of Living.' Your addresses are marked by wide learning, a truly religious spirit and a feeling of reverence for the past. It is the right spirit in which you should approach a study of our old scriptures. Your addresses are all thoughtful and thought-provoking."

—*Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer.*

RELIGION, CULTURE AND PHILOSOPHY

INDIA AND CHINA	BY DR. S. RADHAKRISHNAN	... Rs. 3-12
GAUTAMA THE BUDDHA	BY DR. S. RADHAKRISHNAN	... Re. 1- 0
KALKI OR THE FUTURE OF CIVILIZATION	BY DR. S. RADHAKRISHNAN	... Re. 1- 0
THE INDIAN WAY	BY DR. RANJEE SHAHANI	... Rs. 3- 8
PHASES OF RELIGION AND CULTURE	BY SIR C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR	... Rs. 2- 0
OUR HERITAGE AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE	BY PROF. S. R. SHARMA	... Rs. 6- 8
I, THE BUDDHA	BY J. VIJAYATUNGA	... Re. 1- 4
MODERN INDIAN CULTURE	BY DHURJATI PRASAD MUKERJI	... Rs. 6- 8
EUROPE LOOKS AT INDIA (*A Study in Cultural Relations*)	BY DR. ALEX ARONSON	... Rs. 5- 0
GITA LETTERS	BY SWAMI AVINASANANDA	... Rs. 2-12
TALES AND TEACHINGS OF HINDUISM	BY D. S. SARMA	... Rs. 3- 0
EVOLVING INDIA—Essays on Cultural Issues	BY K. D. SETHNA	... Rs. 2- 8
CHRISTIAN PRAYER AND APPROACH TO CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM	BY REV. FR. W. Q. LASH	... Re. 1- 0
INDIA AND CHINA *—A Thousand Years of Sino-Indian Cultural Contact*	BY DR. PRABODH CHANDRA BAGCHI	... Rs. 4- 0
UPANISHADS—In Story and Dialogue	BY R. R. DIWAKAR	... Rs. 2- 8
TRUTH ABOUT GOD	BY D. Y. DESHPANDE	... Re. 1- 0

HIND KITABS LIMITED, BOMBAY